Daily Report

East Europe

FBIS-EEU-91-124
Thursday
27 June 1991

Daily Report
East Europe

FBIS-EEU-91-124 *27 June 1991*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ALBANIA

Agolli Press Conference on Party Renewal *[ZERI I POPULLIT 18 Jun]* 1
Corruption Alleged in Athens Embassy *[BASHKIMI 20 Jun]* 1
Decree on Agricultural Prices, Grain Subsidies *[ZERI I POPULLIT 19 Jun]* 2
Pashko Statement on Results of Brussels EC Visit *[Tirana Radio]* 2
Reportage on Kapllani's Visit to Greece *[cross-reference]* 3

BULGARIA

BSP Council Resolution on Elections *[DUMA 22 Jun]* 4
Economic Reform Resolution *[DUMA 20 Jun]* 4
Democracy Club Proposes SDS Shadow Government *[BTA]* 7
Controversy Within SDS Continues *[BTA]* 8
Coalition Within SDS Reported, No Split *[BTA]* 8
Federation of Clubs for Democracy Holds Conference *[DEMOKRATSIYA 21 Jun]* 8
Agreement on G-24 150 Million ECU Loan *[BTA]* 9
Foreign Ministry Supports 'Yugoslav Integrity' *[BTA]* 9
Press Upholds Croatian, Slovenian Secession *[TANJUG]* 9
'Concern' Expressed Over Nastase Speech *[BTA]* 10
Press Comment on Nastase Speech on Dobrudzha *[BTA]* 10

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Spokesman on 'Grave Concern' at SFRY Crisis *[CTK]* 11
Dienstbier Interviewed *[Prague TV]* 11
Dienstbier, Poland's Skubiszweski on SFRY *[CTK]* 12
Discuss Soviet Treaties *[CTK]* 12
Dienstbier Interviewed on Civic Movement *[MLADA FRONTA DNES 24 Jun]* 12
Rychetsky on Constitutional Talks, Civic Movement *[OBCANSKY DENIK 22 Jun]* 14
VPN Slovak Council Issues Appeal *[VEREJNOST 24 Jun]* 15
Declaration Published *[VEREJNOST 24 Jun]* 15
VPN Slovak Council Chairman on Political Aims *[NARODNA OBRODA 24 Jun]* 16

HUNGARY

Prime Minister Antall on G-7 Summit *[NEPSZABADSAG 25 Jun]* 17
SZDSZ Representative on Grand Coalition Theory *[MAGYAR HIRLAP 19 Jun]* 18
Party Leaders Assess Coalition Prospects *[MAGYAR HIRLAP 24 Jun]* 19
Parliament Passes Compensation Law *[MTI]* 20
Democratic Forum Leader on Party's Position *[MAGYAR NEMZET 19 Jun]* 21
Oil Consumption, Imports Set To Decline *[MTI]* 22
Bank Official Discusses Bank Stock Ownership *[NEPSZABADSAG 21 Jun]* 22
Population Close to Limits of Tolerance on Prices *[NEPSZABADSAG 24 Jun]* 23
U.S. Government Promises New Trade Preferences *[MTI]* 23
Agriculture Minister on Trade With Ukraine *[MAGYAR HIRLAP 21 Jun]* 23
Foreign Committee Official Meets Romania's Roman *[NEPSZABADSAG 25 Jun]* 24
Trade Talks Held With Germany in Miskolc *[MTI]* 25

POLAND

SFRY Unity, Territorial Integrity Supported *[PAP]* 26

Youth Cooperation Agreement Signed With Ukraine *[PAP]* 26
Walesa Urged To Veto New Sejm Electoral Bill *[PAP]* 26
Vetos Election Law *[PAP]* 27
Presidential Spokesman on Walesa's Situation *[ZYCIE WARSZAWY 24 Jun]* 27
Government-OPZZ Talks 'Suspended' *[PAP]* 28
Maziarski Interviewed on Center Accord Aims *[RZECZPOSPOLITA 24 Jun]* 29

ROMANIA

World Bank Loan of $180 Million Approved *[ROMPRES]* 31
Journalist Writes Open Letter to Iliescu *[ROMANIAI MAGYAR SZO 25 Jun]* 31
President Iliescu's Response to Open Letter *[ADEVARUL 20 Jun]* 32
Further on Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact Statement *[ROMPRES]* 33
Roman Said To Want Power 'At All Costs' *[DREPTATEA 21 Jun]* 33
Banker on Aid, Possible Return to Centralism *[ROMPRES]* 34
Iliescu Receives UNCTAD Secretary General *[ROMPRES]* 34

YUGOSLAVIA

Federal

Jovic: Nation on 'The Brink of Catastrophe' *[TANJUG]* 35
Presidency Session Begins; Absentees Noted *[Zagreb Radio]* 35
FEC Session Discusses Current Situation *[TANJUG]* 35
FEC in Contact With Slovene, Croatian Leaders *[Belgrade Radio]* 35
Court Bans Croatian, Slovene Forces Laws *[TANJUG]* 36
Parties Assess Croatian, Slovene Moves *[TANJUG]* 36
Defense Secretariat Issues Statement *[TANJUG]* 37
Army Commander Promises To Crush Resistance *[Belgrade Radio]* 37
Daily: Secession 'Chief Motivating Force' *[TANJUG]* 37

Slovenia

Immediate Economic Impact of Dissociation Cited *[TANJUG]* 38
Kucan Addresses Slovene Assembly *[Ljubljana Radio]* 38
Further on Kucan's Remarks *[Ljubljana Radio]* 43
Slovenia Will Defend Sovereignty With Arms *[Belgrade Radio]* 44
Slovene Interior Minister on Using Forces *[TANJUG]* 45
Assembly Rejects Constitutional Amendments *[TANJUG]* 45
Slovenia To Apply for UN Membership *[TANJUG]* 45
Internal Affairs Minister Comments on Independence *[Belgrade Radio]* 45
Call For Negotiations, Warning Against Force *[Ljubljana Radio]* 46
Slovene Daily on 'Danger' to Sovereignty *[TANJUG]* 46
Slovenia Threatens To Mine Communications Sites *[TANJUG]* 46
Federal Authorities Close Ljubljana Airport *[Ljubljana Radio]* 47
Runways Blocked; Tanks Deployed *[TANJUG]* 47
Air Traffic Control Still in Belgrade's Hands *[Ljubljana Radio]* 47
All Slovene Airports Reported Closed *[TANJUG]* 47
Citizen's Militia Guard Barricades in Ljubljana *[Vienna Radio]* 47
Rupel Reveals Border Crossing 'Conflicts' *[TANJUG]* 47
Border Situation 'Normal' *[TANJUG]* 48
Border With Italy Closed *[Belgrade Radio]* 48
Slovene Insignia at Ljubelj Border *[TANJUG]* 48
Vienna Radio Reports Army Actions in Slovenia *[Vienna Radio]* 48
Gligorov Sends Message to Kucan *[TANJUG]* 49
Tanks Break Through Ljubljana Blockade of Buses *[TANJUG]* 49
Tanks 'Dispersed Throughout' Ljubljana Area *[Ljubljana Radio]* 49
Army Breaks Through Vrpolje Barricades *[Ljubljana Radio]* 49
No Border Crossings Closed; Barricades Erected *[Belgrade Radio]* 50
Slovenia Protest Over Troop Movements *[TANJUG]* 50
Slovenia Appeals for Loyalty of Army Personnel *[TANJUG]* 50

Croatia

Mesic Says Army Unlikely To Shoot *[TANJUG]* 50
Assembly Suspends Laws; Breaks Until July *[TANJUG]* 50
Babic Expects More Trouble in Krajina *[TANJUG]* 51
Srem Municipalities Want Militia Units *[TANJUG]* 51
Croatian Party Votes Against Sovereignty Act *[TANJUG]* 51
Krajina Demands Croatian Forces Withdraw *[TANJUG]* 51
'Terrorists' Abduct Croat, Serb Policemen *[Zagreb Radio]* 52
Serbian Reservists on Alert in Dvor na Uni *[TANJUG]* 52
Dvor na Uni Declares State of Emergency *[TANJUG]* 52
Kostajnica Declares State of Emergency *[TANJUG]* 52
Krajina Wants Unification With Serbia *[TANJUG]* 53
Attack on Glina Police 'Meticulously Planned' *[Zagreb Radio]* 53
Croatia Says Four Killed in 26 Jun Clashes *[TANJUG]* 53
Glina 'Quiet' After Army Intervention *[Zagreb Radio]* 53
Domestic Journalists Barred From Glina *[Belgrade Radio]* 54
Serbia's Jovic Denounces Slovene, Croatian Acts *[Belgrade TV]* 54
Izetbegovic on Croatian, Slovene Independence *[Belgrade Radio]* 55
Rugova Views Croatian, Slovene Independence *[Zagreb Radio]* 55
Assembly Urges 'Protection for Serbs in Croatia' *[TANJUG]* 55
Serbia To Respect Law Where Krajina Concerned *[TANJUG]* 56
Bosnian Koljevic Supports Krajina Protocol *[TANJUG]* 56

Macedonia

Macedonian Assembly Views 'Immediate' Secession *[Belgrade Radio]* 56
VMRO Prepares Macedonian Independence Call *[Belgrade Radio]* 57

International

Britain Confirms Support for Federal Government *[TANJUG]* 57
TANJUG Cites EC 'Circles' on Situation 57
Greece Fails To Recognize Croatia, Slovenia *[TANJUG]* 57
Belgrade Diplomatic Community Briefed on Situation *[TANJUG]* 58
Bulgaria's Vulkov Denies Recognition of Croatia *[TANJUG]* 58
External Reactions to Republics' Declaration *[AFP]* 58
Tanks Heading for Slovene-Italian Border *[TANJUG]* 59
Situation on Border 'Tense' *[TANJUG]* 59
Slovenia Protests Italian Troop Movements *[Ljubljana Radio]* 59
JNA Armored Units Move Toward Austrian Border *[TANJUG]* 59
Vienna Radio Reports Belgrade Reaction 60

Agolli Press Conference on Party Renewal

AU2606165491 Tirana ZERI I POPULLIT in Albanian 18 Jun 91 p 1

[ZERI I POPULLIT correspondent article: "The Writer and the Party"]

[Text] Yesterday morning, Dritero Agolli, member of the leadership of the Socialist Party, held a press conference in the club of the Union of Writers and Artists of Albania in which a number of writers, artists, and workers in publishing houses and in central press organs participated. We do not exaggerate when we say that, at first, this press conference was very difficult—not only because of the great number and variety of questions but also because of the prejudices of some participants that surfaced during this event.

After Comrade Dritero Agolli spoke about the concept of the new Socialist Party and the ways and possibilities for its complete renewal, he said that the most correct and most acceptable solution for this problem was the one that the congress itself presented with the concurrence of the majority of the delegates. He said: "I have confidence in this renewal because I am entrusting you to the most progressive forces in the ranks of the party. Are not the acceptance of the new program that has been approved, the change in the name, and the distancing from everything that was erroneous in the past signs of a good and hopeful beginning?"

The speaker responded to the many questions from the audience. They were indeed many and it is impossible to cover them all in this article. With regard to the attitude towards the Albanian Workers Party's past and Enver Hoxha, he said the same thing he said in the discussion at the congress. While, with regard to the opposition parties, he said that "the Socialist Party will establish fair and open relations with these parties." In response to a question about the relations of the Albanian Socialist Party with sister parties in Europe, he stressed that we will try to and will make an effort to establish ties with these parties, if they are ready for such a thing. He said: "But, in this regard, I am not talking about the party of Slobodan Milosevic, with which we not only do not have any sort of ties but are in a state of hostility as long as it maintains an obvious Anatolian anti-Albanian attitude."

One of the most significant questions posed to Dritero Agolli dealt with the attitude he will be taking with regard to his earlier works. He said: "I joined the party in 1952, when I did not know that I would become a writer. Because of many things, like other party members, I became disillusioned; but this did not make me hand in my party card. My dignity and courage did not leave me because a person lives by these." Later on, he said: "I need a platform from which to express my opinion, so I have kept this attitude which is now known."

Corruption Alleged in Athens Embassy

AU2706072891 Tirana BASHKIMI in Albanian 20 Jun 91 p 2

[Article by Ylli Galanxhi, former employee of the Albanian Embassy in Athens: "An Ambassador's Exploits"]

[Excerpts] I have closely followed the press articles dealing with the abuses and wheeling and dealing of some of our top officials. Like others, I am disgusted at this endless corruption in high places. In this context, I, too, would like to testify against one of those who stopped at nothing to fleece our poor country.

It would take whole pages to describe the "exploits" of Izedin Hajdini. He performed them all, and even boasts openly of some of them, in the garb of the ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the Republic of Albania to Athens.

Let us talk specifically. An inspection team that came from the Albanian Workers Party Central Committee in May 1990 at the request of the embassy personnel noted financial violations and abuses including the falsification of documents by Ambassador Izedin Hajdini. In short, these falsifications consisted of bogus invoices for endless purchases of goods. However, this was only the tip of the iceberg. [passage omitted]

I learned by chance that our embassy in Greece, or more specifically our ambassador, was accused of obstructing humanitarian aid. Humanitarian "aid" came continually to the embassy address, or rather Izedin's family, from local nationals, in the form of meat, oil, and packets of macaroni, down to medicines, clothes, and children's toys. When it was a matter of genuine humanitarian aid, such as the case of the aid sent by the Greek firm Kilikas on 8 May in the shape of packages of medical supplies for maternity wards, Izedin sent them back where they came from, considering them an insult to our country, which "relies on its own resources." [passage omitted]

One of his friends is familiar to everybody—Sofokli Lazri. How far this man's tentacles stretched! There is no cause for wonder at this, because it is well known that the so-called "professor" and none other controlled the cadre policy of the Foreign Ministry, and not that of the Foreign Ministry alone. As always, the basis for this strong friendship, as generally occurred in such cases, was mutual interest. The professor defended his protege from various "attacks," which were not few in number. In return, the ambassador responded to his patron with "small" favors, always out of the state's pocket, i.e. the embassy. There were innumerable parcels sent to him from Athens. Their love went to the point that in December 1989, on the ambassador's instructions, our entire staff celebrated the professor's 65th birthday at the state's expense. This is not to mention the $1,000 spent on Sofokli Lazri's car and the bill drawn up to show that these dollars were spent on an embassy vehicle! Of course, there was no way that the professor

could fail to be grateful to Izedin Hajdini and to help him when the need arose. We could enlarge on other facts of this kind that do nothing but testify to the bottomless corruption in which some of our officials in high places are sunk. However, what amazes and worries one most is the question: When will the law catch up with them? When will their time come to an end?

Decree on Agricultural Prices, Grain Subsidies

AU2606111591 Tirana ZERI I POPULLIT in Albanian 19 Jun 91 p 1

["Decree on Increasing State Purchase Prices for Some Agricultural Products and Livestock Products and Grain Subsidies for Mountainous Agricultural Cooperatives"; place and date of issue not given]

[Text] On recommendation of the Ministry of the Economy and the Ministry of Agriculture, the Council of Ministers decrees:

1. The purchase prices of wheat, corn, white beans, sunflowers, soy beans, sugar beets, cotton, rice, tobacco, meat, milk, and olives will be in accordance with tables 1, 2, and 3, which are attached to this decree.

2. Agricultural cooperatives in mountainous areas will receive subsidies from the state budget amounting to 120 Albanian leks for each quintal of grain for grains they produce and use for the production of bread for cooperative members and other residents of the village. The quantity of grain for which they will receive a subsidy is calculated on the basis of actual consumption, with no more than 200 kg of grain per capita.

3. The flour the state gives to agricultural cooperatives in mountainous areas for the production of bread is sold at wholesale prices that are implemented in the state sector.

4. The state's price for selling cultivated wheat to the agricultural cooperatives in mountainous areas for production of bread will be 230 leks per quintal and the selling price for corn will be 210 leks per quintal. Expenses of the sales are taken care of by the agricultural cooperatives.

5. The differences in purchasing prices according to Point 1 of this decree as well as the subsidies for wheat, grain, and flour that the state sells to the agricultural cooperatives in mountainous areas for bread are financed out of the state budget.

6. The wheat and flour subsidies for bread will be in effect only for agricultural cooperatives in mountainous areas, insofar as they do not satisfy their needs by their production, with no more than 200 kg of converted grain per capita.

7. Council of Ministers Decision No. 421 of 19 December 1986, "On the Improvement of the State's Relations with Agricultural Cooperatives Through Prices," and Council of Ministers Decision No. 476 of 19 December 1988, "On the Minimum and Maximum Purchasing Prices for Potatoes, Vegetables, Melons, and Fruit," are abrogated.

8. For wheat and milk, this decision goes into effect on 1 June 1991, while for sales of flour and wheat for bread by agricultural cooperatives in mountainous areas and for other products, in accordance with point 1 of this decision, it goes into effect on 1 July 1991.

Ylli Bufi, Chairman of the Council of Ministers.

Pashko Statement on Results of Brussels EC Visit

AU2606164291 Tirana Radio Tirana Network in Albanian 1600 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Dr. Gramoz Pashko, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and minister of the economy, returned home today after a three-day working visit to Brussels, where he met representatives of the Group of 24, which includes the world's 24 economically most developed countries.

He was met at Rinas Airport by Aleksander Meksi, deputy chairman of the People's Assembly Presidency; Zydi Pepa, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers; Leontiev Cuci, secretary of state for the economy; Sokrat Plaka, deputy foreign minister, and other comrades.

On arriving at Rinas Airport, Dr. Gramoz Pashko gave this interview:

[Begin Pashko recording] I would say that we achieved good results, although I must say we had many difficulties, if we are realistic, and, in other words, do not say things that are not true. We talked with high-level officials, with the EC deputy commissioner, and then with various directors of directorates. This means we had two very intensive days of work. The EC promised us that it will give us the food reserves that we requested. They will give them to us in the form of aid or on long-term credit. We asked [words indistinct] to meet all our food needs. Now, everything depends on us. We urgently need to send our team there, to define precisely all that we need.

For their part, they showed signs of goodwill in their readiness to help Albania immediately. A group of experts will come in the first week of July and will examine the situation in the country, to see what the real state of the Albanian economy and the food supply is. These things must be seen, because our reports on such matters are not enough. They must assess the situation themselves.

The other important aspect of the problem is that we must work hard to create an image that we still do not possess, the image of a democratic Albania. We must be very clear on this. If we want to make progress, we must all work together to show the world that we are in favor

of democracy, because there is still plenty of suspicion and hesitation regarding democracy in Albania among political circles in Europe, especially in Europe.

Regardless of what we have achieved in these days, the results of these days and the talks we held were, in my view, insufficient. We must work very hard to show the world that democracy has been established in Albania and that dictatorship has ended. This requires everyone's contribution. There are still persons [words indistinct], if not political forces, who have been very slow in this and should show their dedication to this work for stabilization. Without their support, it is vain to think of stabilization in Albania. [end recording]

Reportage on Kapllani's Visit to Greece

WA2706133191

For Greek reportage on the visit by Foreign Minister Muhamet Kapllani to Greece, including reports on his talks with Greek Foreign Minister Andonios Samaras, see the Greece section of the 27 June West Europe DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

BSP Council Resolution on Elections

AU2606172691 Sofia DUMA in Bulgarian 22 Jun 91 pp 1, 2

["Resolution of the Supreme Council of the Bulgarian Socialist Party on the Elections," adopted at a meeting of the BSP Supreme Council in Sofia on 15 June]

[Text] The forthcoming free and democratic elections for the legislature and the local organs of state authority are the guarantee for further consolidating and developing the democratic pr[illegible]ess in the Republic of Bulgaria. They should constitute a decisive step in the democratization of the country, following the 10 and 17 June 1990 elections for the Grand National Assembly.

The expression of the will of every elector through his right to vote is the only legitimate basis for the formation and activity of the central and local organs of democratic power.

Society expects the forthcoming elections to be conducted on the basis of the country's new democratic constitution.

On 28 May 1991 the Grand National Assembly decided that the legislative and local authority elections should be held in September 1991, following the adoption of the new constitution.

In the municipalities, the authority of the local state organs is at present severely shaken. A democratic and freely elected ordinary National Assembly is essential for a strong executive power. This is why it is necessary that the Grand National Assembly's decision be carried out without any further changes.

This presupposes that the Grand National Assembly must approve and update the electoral laws in a timely manner, and provide all the legal regulations for holding the elections.

The main thing is to provide the necessary guarantees to ensure that the elections constitute a struggle of ideas and platforms, in which the decisive role is played by force of argument, not by the argument of force, street pressure, and extralegislative nondemocratic methods of struggle. Any other method of action would lead the country into anarchy and would place at risk the development of the peaceful transition to democracy and the guarantees for this.

This is why in our view there is no more important and demanding task facing the Grand National Assembly, the Presidency, the government, and the political forces in the country than to do everything in their power to approve the country's new constitution, the relevant laws, and other legal regulations to guarantee all necessary conditions for the preparations and holding of free democratic elections and for organizing a peaceful, tolerant, and civilized election campaign. To achieve this, the political forces, competent state organs, and especially the president, government, and the Central Electoral Commission must assume their share of the obligations.

It is also appropriate to invite authoritative outside observers to attend the forthcoming elections. Their presence will help to further strengthen the international authority of the Republic of Bulgaria as a democratic state subject to the rule of law.

The Bulgarian Socialist Party [BSP] will approach the preparations and holding of the elections for the local authorities and an ordinary National Assembly with confidence and optimism, based on the essence of its policy and its readiness to defend and propagandize its ideals and values and to do everything within its power to defend democracy. Sofia, 15 June 1991. BSP Supreme Council

Economic Reform Resolution

AU2606194991 Sofia DUMA in Bulgarian 20 Jun 91 pp 1, 3

["Resolution of the Supreme Council of the Bulgarian Socialist Party (BSP) on the Reform and Socioeconomic Policy," adopted at meeting of the BSP Supreme Council in Sofia on 16 June]

[Text] The economic reform is entering a decisive new phase. Prices have been liberalized, the administrative apparatus cut, and a change instituted toward a market-based leva exchange rate versus the dollar. In addition, the redistributory functions of the budget have been reduced, and certain attempts made to remove monopolies. Agreement has been reached between the government and the trade unions, and the government has received the support of the political forces.

The next stage has begun already with a new increase in prices. As the reform proceeds, a number of production, financial, and social problems have been revealed that may lead to a sharp aggravation of the economic, social, and political situation.

The state's finances face grave problems. There is small likelihood of the budget receiving the envisaged revenues because of the fall in industrial production (by about 28 percent as compared with January-May 1990), and this may result in the budget and the enterprises being unable to pay the full amounts of compensation payments, pensions, and allowances. It is forecast that prices will increase in June this year by 480 percent as compared with December 1990. There is a danger of a new wave of inflation. The excessively high interest rates threaten many economic enterprises, including cooperative farms, with bankruptcy. A number of enterprises have their warehouses crammed full of goods, yet we face a severe **crisis in the marketplace** as a result of the substantial fall in demand on the domestic market, the loss of markets in the USSR and the countries of central

and eastern Europe, and the insignificant development of exports to Western markets, even now.

All this has led to grave social consequences that are a serious cause of worry to the Bulgarian Socialist Party [BSP]. Unemployment is rising, and the number of jobless is likely to exceed the critical limit of 10 percent. The fall in consumption, high prices, and the fact that the compensation of incomes is far below what was announced, have led to the population's standard of living falling by about 50 percent.

XXX

The BSP Supreme Council confirms its principled position of support for **the economic reform** and the transition to a social market economy. From this viewpoint, the position maintained by the BSP legislative group and the Socialist ministers should be assessed as correct, despite the grave socioeconomic situation and the problems created by the reform itself.

In confirming its support for the government's initial steps, the Supreme Party Council is guided first and foremost by the conviction that, in the specific conditions in which the country found itself in the second half of 1990 and at the start of 1991, no other real possibility existed for the first stage of the reform except to apply severe and even drastic measures in the fields of finance, money circulation, and credit. This was also made necessary by the state of the country's external finances and the need arising from this to reach a working accord with the IMF and the international financial community. This, of course, does not imply automatic support for every specific action taken by the government in implementing the so-called monetary model.

Within the framework of the economic alternative chosen, various solutions may be applied and different sequences for their implementation, and this choice may exert exceptionally great influence on the practical consequences of the reform's measures, as well as on their social cost. This choice is the responsibility of the government. Of course, the government has the obligation to ensure maximum publicity for the considerations and reasons lying behind its practical decisions in implementing the reform.

The proper and full briefing of the public and legislature is not only a prerequisite for preserving the legislative and public consensus reached at the beginning of the year on the main directions of the reform, but also a crucial condition for ensuring that the reform is accepted by the broad strata of the Bulgarian people as a necessity and is supported by the people in the future.

In this connection, the BSP Supreme Council notes with concern the inadequate information provided on the problems of the reform, the tendency for certain responsible decisions to be made by a restricted circle of people, and the unsatisfactory dialogue to date on the reform's progress and results between the government and the legislature and its relevant commissions.

The BSP Supreme Council declares its principled support for the government's actions and **political motivations.** The coalition government formed as a result of the agreement between the main political forces represented in the legislature is at this stage the only real democratic alternative and guarantees comparative stability of the executive power in the country. To block the government's actions or cause it to fall would mean to create a power vacuum, with ensuing dangerous consequences for public order, the country's socioeconomic condition, and the course of the democratic process. Such a development of affairs may cause a chain reaction which would destabilize all democratic institutions, including the Grand National Assembly.

The BSP Supreme Council holds the view that the consistent implementation of the reform is also essential for resolving **basic social issues.** Rejection of the reform at this juncture, failure to bring it to its successful conclusion, would mean leaving the thousands of unemployed without real support. It would mean allowing over two million pensioners, especially those living in the towns, to fall not merely into a desperate situation—they are suffering this now—but even to make it impossible for them to survive. It would mean leaving hundreds of thousands of women without work for a long period. Finally, it would mean allowing unemployment to ruin one generation of our young people, and perhaps more than one. The BSP cannot agree to this.

In expressing its further support for the economic reform, based on the considerations of an economic, political, and social nature set out above, the BSP Supreme Council stresses with all the power at its command that the results to date, especially the social consequences of the reform's measures, require open public and legislative discussion in depth, in order to seek practical ways to harmonize the reform's economic and social goals under the real conditions facing the country today. In our view, the so-called "second phase of the reform" cannot constitute a simple continuation of the first one, and under no circumstances should be fettered within the framework of the monetary model. Such an approach inevitably implies intensifying the trends toward declining production and further exacerbation of social difficulties to an extent that may prove intolerable for a vast proportion of the people. The consequences of such a development with the threat of a social explosion, are unforeseeable.

For this reason the BSP Supreme Council considers that major adjustments are needed in the contents and directions of the reform's measures with a view to supplementing and combining the classical monetary measures with specific measures to halt the decline in production and revive economic activity. It should clearly be understood that in the economy's present state, with the progressive impoverishment of families, enterprises, and the state, society will not be in a position to bear the financial burden connected with providing social security for the people against the excessive fall in living standards and against unemployment. Only a dynamic economy can ensure that the extent

of unemployment is limited and the costs connected with compensation for inflation and the other negative processes can be accepted.

Mass closures of enterprises, economic disorganization, a sharp fall in the degree of utilization of the national production potential cannot be the proper way to achieve economic and financial stabilization. A permanent balance between supply and demand cannot be achieved if the monetary measures being applied, combined with the necessary curbing of demand, lead to a shrinking of consumption unprecedented not only for our own, but also for world economic policy.

Guided by these principled considerations and by concern with ensuring the success of the economic reform at an acceptable social price, the BSP Supreme Council considers it necessary for the government, with the full cooperation of the legislature, to pay particular attention to the following:

1. Rational measures to stimulate production through tax and interest rate concessions for efficient enterprises; giving priority to allocating the foreign currency and financial resources granted by the international financial institutions for production purposes; and drafting a specific industrial policy aimed at assisting the small and medium-sized private production sector; cooperative and state enterprises in their efforts to use their production potential to better effect.

2. An active policy to encourage exports as a primary, and perhaps chief, factor for galvanizing production in the present conditions. As well as the correct measures for liberalizing imports and exports that are being introduced at the moment, a specific program is required to provide incentives for exports in return for convertible currency, especially to Western markets. In parallel with this, the government should bring to a conclusion its efforts to revive the traditional trade links with the Soviet Union and the countries of eastern Europe, without which, given the present conditions and the real structure of Bulgarian industry, it is impossible to achieve even a minimum employment of the production capacities in a number of crucial industrial sectors, most of all in machine building, electronics, and light industry. This program for stimulating exports should include specific incentives and concessions for producers and exporters.

3. The structural reorganization of the economy has nothing in common with a situation that creates a danger of mass bankruptcies of enterprises and may affect hundreds and even thousands of labor collectives in all branches of the economy, including agriculture. In this situation, not only inefficient enterprises with no future from the structural viewpoint are threatened with financial insolvency, but also enterprises that in principle have favorable economic and market prospects and a good production and technological potential. Unless additional measures are taken to provide temporary assistance for such enterprises, the consequences for the economy may prove to be catastrophic. Here one is referring not only to widespread unemployment, but also to a depreciation of the national capital and a loss of positions in the international markets. These consequences would be irreversible.

4. Support should be given to the decisions recently adopted by the government to preserve jobs and provide incentives for companies that are creating new jobs. This policy should be extended and should become one of the main directions of the reform during the next stage. Particular attention should be paid to the towns and regions in which severe and chronic unemployment is emerging.

The fight against inflation and the stringent financial and monetary measures cannot be regarded as ends in themselves, especially if the price to be paid for them is unemployment, which, as the government itself admits, may exceed half a million. Bulgarian society is unable to bear this cost. It is necessary to reassess the reform's priorities to some extent, including from the viewpoint of the financial and monetary goals, in order to prevent such a development of events.

5. Finally, it is perfectly correct to pay attention to supporting the small and medium-sized producers, especially the private and cooperative companies. The BSP Supreme Council believes that this policy line meets the demands of the transition to a mixed market economy. The acceleration of the small privatization, for which all necessary legislative and organizational conditions have been created, may produce comparatively quick results from the viewpoints of employment, expanding the supply of goods and services, and increasing the incomes of the state and the citizens.

However, the pursuing of this correct line should not lead one to neglect the economic possibilities of the state sector, which at present produces the major part of the national product and provides employment for the vast majority of the workers in our country.

In this connection, it is a matter of concern that in a number of cases a mechanical splitting up of state companies is being carried out under the banner of demonopolization and decentralization. Some of these actions, which have been undertaken in a command-administrative style, do not bring about any real stimulation of competition in the domestic market and are not in line with objective market criteria and factors.

6. The condition of agriculture causes particular anxiety. The thesis of giving it priority importance in the national economic system is not being confirmed in practice. Clear evidence is already available of a sharp fall in agricultural production and a decline in the numbers of animals and plots of land sown with crops, which arouses doubts that normal supplies can be ensured for the internal market during subsequent periods.

The labor cooperative farms have been placed in a particularly difficult situation, although it is quite clear that at the present stage of the agrarian reform they bear the main responsibility for feeding the Bulgarian people. The necessary material and financial conditions have not been created for developing private farming. For this reason, the government and the legislature must not only urgently examine the actual state of agriculture and adopt measures to revive it, but also consider the principles of a new agrarian policy aimed at fully utilizing the country's immense potential in this sphere and ensuring the social stability of the Bulgarian countryside.

7. It is evident that it is impossible within the terms of office of the present legislature and government to undertake an overall structural reform of the economy. This should be regarded as a lengthy and many-sided process, whose aim is to build up a stable and competitive economy with full employment of the able-bodied working population.

At this stage, one is entitled to expect the government to outline in general terms its strategy for the structural reform and start to apply certain specific measures to support and encourage the priority sectors of the economy, such as agriculture, industry, tourism, and services.

However, in addition to this, one should under no circumstances permit neglect of the possibilities of the production, technological, and intellectual potential already created in such leading sectors of the contemporary scientific and technological revolution as electronics, telecommunications, precision engineering, biotechnologies, chemical synthesis, and so on.

In connection with the preparations for the structural reform, the government and the Grand National Assembly must draft the foundations of a new and active investment credit policy, creating the relevant financial investment institutions.

XXX

The implementation of the reform presupposes the preservation of social peace as an absolutely essential condition. The BSP Supreme Council welcomes the efforts being made by the government, trade union organizations, and employers' unions within the framework of the trilateral dialogue, and supports the agreement they signed on 23 June 1991 [date as received]. The BSP Supreme Council calls upon the Socialists and their supporters to support this necessary compromise, in order to allow the economic reform to continue and to alleviate as far as possible the reform's negative social consequences.

The BSP Supreme Council is convinced that under the present extremely difficult economic circumstances, when the fate of many enterprises is at stake, solidarity and mutual support are essential in the interrelations between the labor collectives and their economic leaderships, which must prove their competence and qualities in the new conditions—in the name of stabilizing the enterprises and companies, and of ensuring an overall revival of economic life in the country.

Guided by the above assessments and specific directions for action, the BSP Supreme Council and the BSP legislative group express their readiness to cooperate with the government and all constructive legislative and extralegislative forces in order to further implement the transition to a social market economy and overcome the grave socioeconomic crisis facing the country today.

Democracy Club Proposes SDS Shadow Government

AU2706124991 Sofia BTA in English 0949 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] Sofia, June 27 (BTA)—In today's "24 CHASA" the leader of the Federation of Democracy Clubs, Mr. Petko Simeonov, launches the idea of a "government in shadow," in which the key ministries are to be held by the opposition Union of Democratic Forces (SDS). According to Mr. Simeonov, such a government would be interested in seeking unity of the opposition and might span the gap between the parties and organizations in the SDS, the unity of which seems to be quite problematic at present.

The idea for a "government in shadow" was also suggested in the lobbies during the national conference of the opposition last Saturday, not only as a way for uniting the SDS, but also as a sign of its readiness to take over the executive power.

Ten days ago journalist Vladimir Kostov expressed another idea for uniting the opposition on Radio Free Europe and in the Bulgarian press: he suggested that President Zhelyu Zhelev re-assume the leadership of the opposition. President Zhelev, however, rejected such a possibility in a statement for the BTA.

Mr. Simeonov promoted the idea for a "government in shadow" not to oppose the present government but as a need for the integration of the united opposition. In Mr. Simeonov's opinion, the existence of two governments is a guarantee for a normal state. He also told "24 CHASA" that the government's platform should be drawn first: removal of regulations obstructing the development of market economy, establishing structures to determine the guilt of the rulers in the last decades, removal of the discredited functionaries from the state apparatus and the carrying out of a perfect demonopolization.

If the "government in shadow" had been set up immediately after the elections, the SDS would not have had to resort to improvised actions at the time of the downfall of Lukanov's cabinet, says Mr. Simeonov. Other opposition leaders share his opinion.

Controversy Within SDS Continues

AU2706074091 Sofia BTA in English 1745 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Iva Toncheva report]

[Text] Sofia, June 26 (BTA)—Judging by the two press conferences today, of the Social Democrats and of the MP's who walked out of parliament, the contradictions in the opposition Union of Democratic Forces (SDS) have not yet been ironed out, despite the compromise reached between the moderates and the radicals at the National Conference last Saturday, which defined the SDS as a national movement of parties, organizations and citizens.

The moderates—SDS-Centre, and the Liberal Bloc—continue to speak of the SDS as a coalition while the "Group-39" radicals call the SDS a movement.

At the regular press conference of the Bulgarian Social Democratic Party [BSDP] today, its leader Dr. Petur Dertliev sharply criticized the radicals of attempting to turn the SDS into a movement, thus repelling many of the opposition's followers. He stated explicitly that the influential BSDP will not leave the SDS but will run in the elections on a preferential proportional list or two lists.

Mr. Stoyan Ganev told BTA that this means a split, though unofficial, in the SDS. "Group 39" insists on a single ballot-paper of the SDS in the coming elections.

Judging by statements of representatives of the radicals and the moderates, the two wings in the SDS are almost not on speaking terms. They are negotiating with parties and organizations outside the SDS.

Today, at a press conference of "Group 39," already numbering about 50, the radicals confirmed once again in a special declaration that they will not return to parliament until the scheduling of its dissolution and of new elections for September. The radicals accuse the parliament of unprecedented rushing through the passage of the constitution. In their opinion, this rush will result in a constitution which will not correspond to the interests of society. The opposition daily "DEMOKRATSIYA" recently wrote that there had been about 500,000 "dead souls" in last year's elections, and noted that "Group 39" can present more information and evidence to the prosecutor general.

Coalition Within SDS Reported, No Split

AU2606142691 Sofia BTA in English 1323 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Iva Toncheva report]

[Text] Sofia, June 26 (BTA)—A well-informed source from the circles of the Social Democrats told BTA today that the SDS [Union of Democratic Forces]-Centre (the Bulgarian Social Democratic Party [BSDP] and the Nikola Petkov Bulgarian Agrarian Party) and the Liberal Bloc (the Green Party, Ecoglasnost and the Federation of Democracy Clubs) have decided to form a coalition within the Union of Democratic Forces. According to this source this has been included in the pre-election agreement draft. The coalition is open to other parties. It seems that the National Conference on June 22 failed to iron over the contradictions between moderates and radicals in the SDS.

On Monday [24 June] Mr. Lyubomir Ivanov from the Green Party expressed the opinion that the recommendations of Saturday's [22 June] National Conference might help the SDS overcome the internal contradictions, but a new election agreement between the SDS member-parties and organizations is also needed. He also made the reservation that the new Elections Act should be taken into consideration.

Yesterday Mr. Velko Vulkanov, a jurist not affiliated to any party and elected in parliament on the BSP [Bulgarian Socialist Party] list, said that political talks are being held on the new Elections Act. This was also confirmed by SDS MP's who remained in parliament. The most influential parties within the SDS—the BSDP and the Nikola Petkov BZNS—as well as the Green Party support the proportional system. According to a well-informed source, the BSP has still not determined its final stand. So far leaders and jurists in the BSP have expressed only personal stands, most of them favouring the mixed system.

At the regular press conference of the Bulgarian Social Democratic Party today its leader Dr. Petur Dertliev stated that the BSDP is for a preferential list or for two lists within the SDS's ballot paper. "The electorate should be able to see our faces," he pointed out. The BSDP is dissatisfied with Saturday's National Conference of the SDS. Those who want the SDS to be a movement do all they can to obliterate the parties' independence, they claim. Mr. Aleksandur Yordanov of the Radical Democratic Party writes in "VEK 21" today that "truth triumphed" on Saturday, that is, the cause of the radical "Group 39" that has boycotted parliament since May 14.

The BSDP will declare its final stand on 29 June, when a meeting of its National Committee will be held. The leadership of the Green Party will also hold a meeting. Today BSDP leader Dr. Dertliev rejected emphatically the possibility of the BSDP leaving the SDS. "We are the founders of the SDS, others came later, when it was easier and more secure," he said.

Federation of Clubs for Democracy Holds Conference

AU2606172291 Sofia DEMOKRATSIYA in Bulgarian 21 Jun 91 p 2

[Vladimir Munzelov: "Federation of Clubs for Democracy Moving Toward Liberalism"]

[Text] The first conference of the Federation of Clubs for Democracy [FKD] began on 20 June in the spa town of Bankya. In order to dispel eventual rumors and doubts, Petko Simeonov explained at the beginning of his speech that the conference was being held in Bankya purely for financial reasons—the costs of renting a hall and hotel accommodation were much too expensive in Sofia. Mr. Simeonov drew attention to the fact that there were 109 Clubs for Democracy in the country, uniting 12,000-13,000 people, and most importantly, uniting the intelligentsia.

The declaration of the Elin Pelin Club for Democracy was heard, which states that the conference has been hastily called in order to "pass decisions already made by the FKD leadership." The members of the Elin Pelin club are not in agreement with the idea of turning the FKD into a political party.

The declaration of the Club for Democracy from the capital's Nadezhda municipality also stresses that the FKD conference has been called with very little publicity beforehand and at an inconvenient time—the eve of the third National Conference of the Union of Democratic Forces [SDS]. For this reason the Nadezhda municipality's Club for Democracy passed a vote of no confidence in the federation's present leadership.

Khristo Ivanov, vice chairman of the SDS Central Executive Committee, said that the federation must form its views on the SDS's participation in the forthcoming elections. It must work out its stance on the SDS strategy.

The 137 delegates who attended the conference will adopt an organizational charter, a program, and a resolution, and will choose the federation's new leadership.

The following is written in the FKD draft organizational charter: "The federation's aim is to create an open-minded, democratic, society in Bulgaria," and to achieve this the FKD will "use all lawful means, including taking part at a central and local level in legislative, executive, and judicial power."

The FKD conference continues 21 June.

Agreement on G-24 150 Million ECU Loan

AU2606170091 Sofia BTA in English 1553 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Boyko Borisov report]

[Text] Sofia, June 26 (BTA)—Bulgaria will be granted ECU 150 million—about 180 million dollars—as the first tranche of a G-24 loan. The agreement on the loan for the stabilization of Bulgaria's economy will be signed these days, Finance Minister Ivan Kostov told BTA at Sofia airport before his departure to Vienna. He said he would do 'some very important work" there but declined to give further details. Mr. Kostov will attend the signing of the agreement on the loan granted by the G-24 in Brussels on July 2.

Mr. Kostov provided important details on the development of economic contacts between Bulgaria and Japan to which, according to him, the media have not paid due attention so far. Besides the 100 million dollars Japan granted recently as part of the G-24 loan—an important prerequisite for the favourable conditions of the loan—Japan has agreed in principle to credit investments in Bulgaria's infrastructure and environmental protection. Mr. Kostov believes there are favourable prospects for a loan from Japan.

"And what is most important for me is that the Japanese Government has declared that it has regained confidence in Bulgaria as a financial partner," Mr. Kostov said.

Foreign Ministry Supports 'Yugoslav Integrity'

AU2606123691 Sofia BTA in English 1152 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Sofia, June 26 (BTA)—After late last night the Bulgarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs refuted foreign press reports that Bulgaria had recognized the sovereignty and independence of Croatia, today it came out with a special declaration for the press.

On June 25, 1991 Slovenia and Croatia declared their independence and sovereignty, this act of volition of the peoples of Slovenia and Croatia deserves to be studied with the greatest of attention and seriousness, it is stated in the declaration.

The Bulgarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs underlines that Bulgaria backs up the assertion of the democratic processes in the separate republics, she stands for taking into account the realities and for respecting the interests of all, she is for a reasonable dialogue by which the Yugoslavian peoples will be able to choose the future structure of the country and determine the relations between the republics independently and on the basis of equality. The declaration confirms that Bulgaria is for the preservation of Yugoslavia's integrity and for the development of her relations both with Yugoslavia and the Yugoslavian republics.

Answering a question, Mr. Minko Sladkarov, head of the Balkan Countries Department of the Foreign Ministry, told a news conference today that there is no information from diplomatic sources about a statement of Mr. Franjo Tudjman's saying that Bulgaria recognizes the independence of Croatia that was declared.

Press Upholds Croatian, Slovenian Secession

LD2606173791 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1523 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Sofia, June 26 (TANJUG) - The Bulgarian paper DUMA today upheld yesterday's decisions of the Yugoslav republics of Slovenia and Croatia to secede.

"On the day of Croatia's and Slovenia's independence, we should simply congratulate the Slovene and Croatian brothers," it is set out in a text by DUMA's correspondent in Belgrade.

The paper criticizes Bulgaria's president Zhelyo Zhelev for publicly upholding the thesis on preserving "the artificial conglomerate called Yugoslavia."

At the same time, the Bulgarian paper DEMOKRATIYA today sets out the assessment that the irresponsible and criminal policy of Belgrade will be the only one to blame for a civil war in Yugoslavia.

The daily NARODNA ARMIYA, an organ of the Bulgarian National Defence Ministry, published a text which openly upholds the decisions of Croatia and Slovenia to secede.

'Concern' Expressed Over Nastase Speech

AU2606124291 Sofia BTA in English 1153 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Sofia, June 26 (BTA)—Bulgaria expresses its great concern over making official estimations in public which provide an arbitrary interpretation of historical facts, it is said in a declaration of the Bulgarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs circulated today. The declaration was issued in connection with the speech delivered by Romania's minister of foreign affairs, Mr. Adrian Nastase, in the Romanian Parliament on June 24. In his speech Mr. Nastase connected the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact with Romania's "losing southern Dobrudzha" which was "occupied by Bulgaria." According to the Bulgarian side, such statements are inconsistent with the international agreements. They are likely to create certain moods in the Romanian public which may have a negative impact on the climate of trust and good neighbourly relations in the Balkans, Bulgaria's Ministry of Foreign Affairs stresses.

It is well known that Bulgaria lost southern Dobrudzha as a result of the Second Balkan War in 1913, but regained it in 1940 under the Treaty of Craiova. Throughout the history of Romania and Bulgaria, southern Dobrudzha has never been Romanian territory but for a short period between 1913 and 1940, it is said in the declaration.

Today Mr. Minko Sladkarov, head of the Balkan Countries Department, told the press that, in his mind, Mr. Nastase's speech was intended to produce a certain effect inside Romania.

Yesterday Mr. Nastase told the Bulgarian ambassador to Romania that his speech had been misinterpreted in Bulgaria and that most probably there is some misunderstanding. Mr. Nastase said that his historical flashback had no bearing on the present development of the relations between Bulgaria and Romania which are friendly and advancing well.

Press Comment on Nastase Speech on Dobrudzha

AU2706094891 Sofia BTA in English 0918 GMT 27 Jun 91

[From BTA review of Sofia press on 27 June]

[Text] Sofia, June 27 (BTA)—The press frontpages a statement of Romania's Minister of Foreign Affairs Mr. Nastase to the Bulgarian ambassador in Bucharest, saying that Romania has no territorial claims on Bulgaria. He said that his speech in the Romanian parliament on June 24 had been misinterpreted, he had only meant it in the historical sense. The speech was purely historical, the spokesman for the Romanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs Trajan Kebeleu told "TRUD." In a feature headlined "Real Appetites or a Gaffe of Bucharest Diplomacy," "ZEMYA" quotes the head of the Balkan Department of the Bulgarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Minko Sladkarov, as saying that it is hard to understand how a politician (Nastase) could make such statements. However, Mr. Sladkarov did not exclude the possibility that Mr. Nastase's speech might have been meant for internal use only. Under the headline "Dobrudzha—Ancient Bulgarian Land" "ZEMYA" carries an article by Aleksandur Dimitrov describing the "deep indignation of the population of the north-eastern region at the ambitions of Romanian nationalists." "ZEMYA" quotes statements of representatives of the Fatherland Party and the Nikola Petkov Bulgarian Agrarian Party. Mr. Kiril Stoychev expresses his personal opinion in "TRUD": The restraint of Bulgarian diplomats is unpardonable, according to him. He also reminds that in northern Dobrudzha there are quite a few Bulgarians.

Spokesman on 'Grave Concern' at SFRY Crisis

LD2606190591 Prague CTK in English 1603 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Prague June 26 (CTK)—Czechoslovak president's spokesman Michael Zantovsky today expressed "grave concern at the development of the situation in Yugoslavia".

"Czechoslovakia continues to regard the Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia as a single state on Yugoslav territory recognised under international law", Zantovsky said in a statement made available to CTK.

"The constitutional crisis in Yugoslavia can be solved only in a peaceful and democratic way, without the use of violence and in harmony with the principles of the U.N. Charter and documents of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Further destabilisation in Yugoslavia can threaten the process of understanding and cooperation in Europe, as well as the peaceful progress of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe towards stable democracy and European integration", the statement said.

"The secession of Slovenia and Croatia from Yugoslavia will have an indirect impact on the Czechoslovak Federation and we will be waiting in suspense to see what kind of impact it will have", Czech Premier Petr Pithart said at a press conference here today.

He said everyone in the Czech Government has a private opinion but the government does not deal with foreign policy at its sessions because it falls under the competence of the Federal Government.

Dienstbier Interviewed

LD2606230891 Prague Federal 1 Television Network in Czech 2020 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Interview with Foreign Minister Jiri Dienstbier by unidentified reporter in Prague studio—live]

[Text] [Reporter] I now welcome Czechoslovak Foreign Minister Jiri Dienstbier here in the studio. Good evening.

[Dienstbier] Good evening.

[Reporter] Minister, what is Czechoslovakia's position on the declaration of independence by Croatia and Slovenia?

[Dienstbier] I believe that these first clashes show that our fears were well founded. Of course, we support or understand the aspirations of the European nations for their own national identity, but in the given situation we must proceed strictly from democratic and legal procedures. Such matters must be the subject of agreement, and if a country wishes to be independent, then it can only do this on the basis of agreement with the international community. Let us not forget that it was because of nationalist conflicts in the Balkans and in Central and Eastern Europe that two world wars have already taken place, and that is why the international community is very sensitive to this. So we take the view that the only entity under international law is Yugoslavia, that what is happening is, for the time being, an internal political matter, and if in the future some agreement is reached that does not destabilize the situation in Europe, then the right to self-determination can naturally apply.

[Reporter] There is considerable speculation at the moment about the step taken by Croatia and Slovenia. Do you share the view that their declaration of independence could lead to the violent breakup of Yugoslavia?

[Dienstbier] As you can see, that is already beginning, and we will see what happens next. I hope that they will all see sense and start talking.

[Reporter] Even before these events, the United States cautioned that such a step could lead to the destabilization of the whole of Eastern Europe. Do you share that view?

[Dienstbier] We have already made our views known in common at the Pentagonal meeting in Bologna, and again last week in Berlin the foreign ministers of the 35 Helsinki states commented quite unequivocally on this matter. We stressed the need for the integrity of Yugoslavia as an entity under international law, a democratic resolution, the need to uphold human rights and democratic processes in the transformation of Yugoslavia. If this process were to continue, there is no telling where it could end. We know that there are similar conflicts in very many areas of Eastern and Central Europe, and none of us can afford to support disintegration by force.

[Reporter] Do you believe this step by Slovenia and Croatia can be likened to, for example, the Baltic republics' efforts to attain independence?

[Dienstbier] I would not make this sort of comparison, because the Baltic republics are in a somewhat different situation. The Baltic republics were independent states that were occupied by a great power, whereas Yugoslavia came into being as a voluntary alliance of its republics, and consequently it can only part company voluntarily. The Baltic republics too, of course, can only be independent if there is agreement, because any sort of solution by force is impossible for them.

[Reporter] Do you believe there is any similarity between the step taken by Slovenia and Croatia and the efforts by certain forces in our country and, to be specific, in Slovakia?

[Dienstbier] I would put it like this: Slovenia and Croatia want independence. I am convinced that the majority of the Slovak people wish to be in the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic. I believe it is very irresponsible to say on the one hand that we want to be part of a common state and on the other hand to trumpet various slogans about a confederation. After all, a confederation is not a common state; a confederation can only arise when there exist two independent states which agree to have a common customs system, financial system, and so forth. It is the creation of a sort of loose union of two

independent entities. Note too that there is no confederation in existence. There exists a state called Confederation Helvetica, which is Switzerland; that old name has been retained, but it has one central government and cantonal self-government. So you cannot say in the same breath that we favor a common state and at the same time call for a confederation, or something of that sort.

I would like to add one very crucial thing here: Czechoslovakia is seen by the world as the most promising stabilizing factor in Central and Eastern Europe. If we manage to resolve the issue of the Czechoslovak Federation and, if possible, resolve it as quickly as we can, we would win enormous prestige by becoming a truly stabilizing factor, and in addition we would demonstrate that such a solution is possible. That, of course, would bring us the appropriate international recognition and it would give a boost to all the forces in Central and Eastern Europe which are vesting their hopes in the triumph of democracy, the shift to democracy in this part of the world.

[Reporter] Thank you for that interview, Minister.

Dienstbier, Poland's Skubiszweski on SFRY

LD2606132691 Prague CTK in English 1225 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Prague June 26 (CTK)—Czechoslovak Foreign Minister Jiri Dienstbier said today that the decision of the parliaments of Croatia and Slovenia to declare independence is a certain stage on the path towards a new state setup in Yugoslavia.

At a press conference, Dienstbier said "We are against any forms of pressure and use of force, and favour respect for human rights and the solution of Yugoslavia's problems by a democratic agreement and not by unilateral steps".

Polish Foreign Minister Krzysztof Skubiszewski, visiting Czechoslovakia for the second day today, recalled at the press conference the recent meeting of foreign ministers of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) signatory states in Berlin, which emphasised the need to preserve Yugoslavia's integrity, with due respect for the human rights of its entire population. He said a preliminary recognition of the independence of Croatia and Slovenia would run counter to international law.

Federal Foreign Ministry spokesman Egon Lansky informed journalists of a statement of the Slovak Ministry for International Relations, regarding the declaration of independence of Croatia and Slovenia. The ministry sees Slovenia's and Croatia's attempts at achieving independence as a natural response to the wrongs committed by the communist regime. It hopes that ways will be found to assert this sovereignty in a union with the other republics of Yugoslavia, preventing bloodshed or destabilisation in that part of Europe.

Asked whether he saw any parallel between developments in Yugoslavia and the Baltic republics' efforts to achieve independence, Dienstbier said that the situations in the two regions were different but, he added, there were many common features in the expressions of nationalism in Central and Eastern Europe, which are a natural reaction to unresolved problems in former communist regimes.

Discuss Soviet Treaties

LD2606181291 Prague CTK in English 1520 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Prague June 26 (CTK)—Czechoslovak Foreign Minister Jiri Dienstbier said today that Czechoslovakia and Poland would not accept a clause in their bilateral treaties being prepared with the Soviet Union which would rule out future membership in a hostile military pact by either side.

The treaties with the Soviet Union was one of the subjects of Dienstbier's talks here with his Polish counterpart, Krzystof Skubiszewski, yesterday and today.

Dienstbier also said that East European countries are interested in the speediest and most peaceful withdrawal of Soviet troops from the territory of the former East Germany.

According to Dienstbier, Czechoslovakia is not opposed in principle to the troops' transit across Czechoslovak territory but a "Czechoslovak route" would be of minor importance because it would be used only for the transfer of the troops to the Ukraine or to southern Russia. It would have to be based on an agreement, Dienstbier said.

Skubiszewski noted that the transport of Soviet forces from Germany across Poland started in May although no agreement has been signed.

He said Poland is the only one of the former Soviet bloc states not to have an agreement on the withdrawal of Soviet troops stationed on its territory. (The Soviet troops' pullout from Czechoslovakia was completed last week.)

Skubiszewski said he was very satisfied with his two-day talks and added that there is no difference of opinion between Czechoslovakia and Poland on basic issues.

He said that Polish President Lech Walesa will visit Czechoslovakia at the end of the summer but no date has been set. A Czechoslovak-Polish treaty, which is nearly ready, is to be signed during the visit, Skubiszewski added. According to a Czechoslovak Foreign Ministry official, experts will meet for another session in the first half of July to finalise the provisions.

The Polish minister later left for Bratislava to pay a visit to Slovakia.

Dienstbier Interviewed on Civic Movement

AU2606140691 Prague MLADA FRONTA DNES in Czech 24 Jun 91 pp 1, 3

[Interview with Jiri Dienstbier, chairman of the Civic Movement and federal minister of foreign affairs, by

Karel Hvizdala; place and date not given: "Whatever Is Not Ecological, That Is Not Economical"]

[Text] [Hvizdala] Lately, the political scene has been distinctly polarizing into right and left wings. How will you and your movement react to this phenomenon?

[Dienstbier] The concept of the right and the left bothers me. It is a traditional concept coined after the French Revolution. However, these extremes often define themselves in a way that defies the historical features of the right or left wings. For example, nationalism is a typically right-wing value. Yet, this notion is toyed with by those who are classified as left wing in today's Czechoslovakia. Or: Some contemporary right-wingers behave in a very authoritative manner. In the past decades, this was the conduct demonstrated by the regime that claimed to be a left-wing one. Traditionally, the left wing has been partial to the freedom of personality, human rights, occasionally as far as anarchism, refusal of the law and order state. It was internationalist and, at the same time, we lived in a large prison enclosed by barbed wire, etc., etc.

[Hvizdala] What is the specific program of the Civic Movement for the immediate future?

[Dienstbier] Right now, work must be accelerated on completing democratic structures and the necessary tools of the economic reform. The faster the economic transition is implemented, the sooner the basis for a functioning democracy and prosperity will be created. Unfortunately, again, many discussions are not to the point, and there are attempts to attack everyone who thinks of a concrete economic policy. The concepts like market economy, privatization, or private ownership thus acquire the form of a magic formula. They are becoming an obsession similar to the past regime's planned economy, nationalization, or communal ownership. Although Adam Smith's invisible hand of the market is still valid, after 200 years, its setting has changed from the world of manufacturing to that of computers. The 100 years of the history of socialism are also a consequence of the imperfection of this concept. The communist system, then, is the punishment. It is quite natural that the invisible hand is emphasized in reaction to the communist deviation. However, we created the experience of the world economic crisis as well as of various types of social engineering, i.e. of all situations in which society focused only on a certain aspect. After all, in Czechoslovakia, Masaryk already knew this as he wrote the Social Question. Moreover, over the past decades an awareness arose of the links between the economy and the ecology. If something is not ecological, it is not economical either. We must breathe on the way to prosperity, if possible without gas masks.

[Hvizdala] Let us return once more to the original question: How would you specify your own role and that of the movement you head today?

[Dienstbier] First of all, I work as minister of foreign affairs. That alone is very time-consuming and energy-demanding. The combination of the two offices is even more taxing. On the other hand, it provides me with a new perspective, with the possibility of viewing the situation not only from the inside but from the outside as well. I know what foreigners consider positive and negative. Therefore, I cannot become a victim of the local passions of the moment and of concentration on one's own affairs. For instance, Manfred Woerner and other politicians consider the peaceful development in Czechoslovakia in 1968 (until the arrival of the Russians) and the Velvet Revolution to be of the utmost value. They see it as a high political culture, with which our nations were able to attempt and eventually realize a fundamental change. I would say that this is the basis of our position in Europe and in the world. They are concerned, just as we are, with the stability of this country—whether Czechoslovakia will be an element of construction or of disintegration in Europe. We cannot get anywhere without stability. We have seen that in the long-lasting conflicts in Poland and in the separatist tendencies in the USSR and Yugoslavia.

[Hvizdala] All foreigners, at least those I met, highly value the fact that we do not strike....

[Dienstbier] So far, we have managed to keep it that way. The voices of people condemning the velvet attitude are dangerous. By now, the term might be tiring—but the other alternative is disintegration.

[Hvizdala] And the role of the Movement...?

[Dienstbier] I realize that the term Civic Movement does not say much about the content. However, most traditional terms are also misleading or not very elucidating. They all have some history, for better or worse. For instance, the "republican" parties were so denoted to contrast with the monarchist ones. The conservatives should preserve something—established values, for instance. However, what is there to preserve here?, etc. Some of us speak of the "center." That is correct insofar as we are against any kind of extremism, bigotry, or fundamentalism. We want to be a modern element in the political spectrum, i.e. a civic element. The parties were traditionally labor, agrarian, tradesman, entrepreneurian, etc. The success of modern parties lies in the integration of interests. In this respect, even some Western socialist parties, bearing the name for perhaps 100 years, do not change their name, but they are in reality just large liberal parties. That is particularly true of Italian, Spanish, and French Socialists, or of members of the British Labour Party, and it becomes more true as time goes by. Of course, they are a part of the political spectrum in stable democratic societies with normal economic systems. Here, we have deviated too far toward the negative aspects of socialism, and our task for a long time to come will be a transition to the normal state.

[Hvizdala] Could you be specific about how you, as the chairman, will react to the polarization that is felt even within your movement? One can detect the shift of one group to the right—Pithart, Buresova—and another one—Jicinsky, Rychetsky—to the left....

[Dienstbier] I do not see it that way. Nevertheless: If one speaks of the center, one must be aware that there is no

absolute center. If a political organism is described as a center one, it necessarily means that some are to the left and others to the right of it. After all, this is generally valid. Even within a right-wing party, there is a center, and on this imaginary, unrevealing scale, there are some left of center and others right of it. Hence, we have again reached a misleading division. Thus, the issue is really who emphasizes what questions. It is often given by the person's professional orientation, sometimes by his or her personal characteristics, by their work style, or appearance. That, too, can become a matter of politics, because on the outside it could be perceived as a different political stand or style.

[Hvizdala] So you are not concerned about the danger of the movement splitting up?

[Dienstbier] At this time, I see tendencies to build up the movement. Furthermore, there is the impact of an element that is often underestimated, namely, the cooperation within Charter 77. People of most diverse opinions, religions, etc., were able for 13 years to join forces in the struggle against the totalitarian regime. This provided us with a habit of political discussion. This mechanism still functions, and I feel it not only within the movement but in the relationship with most of the signatories who are now organized in other political groupings. Again, we hold different opinions, but we understand one another, and there are no signs of that hostility so often demonstrated in public today.

[Hvizdala] How does the founding of the Club of Czech Realists affect all this?

[Dienstbier] First, as far as I am concerned, I pointed out the need for developing Masaryk's realism as early as the fall of last year when the Civic Forum was splitting up. Moreover, at the constituent assembly of the Civic Movement, I spoke about the fact that everything has been discussed in the past, but our most valuable political tradition, the tradition of Masaryk, his realism, tolerance, democracy, a serious, scientific approach, is the necessary moral basis of politics. Therefore, I would consider it very valuable if such a club would concern itself with the cultivation of our politics and building walls against any kind of primitivism and frenzy. Of course, I admit that the declaration of the club lacked coordination, and that could cast doubts on the whole idea.

[Hvizdala] How exactly do you want to shape yourselves?

[Dienstbier] I have spoken about most of it already. The basic value is freedom and democracy; that includes freedom of enterprise. The principal topics are—human rights, legal order, overcoming the contradiction in economy, social policy, and ecology, emphasis on the integrity of human personality, including its cultural and educational conditions, self-administration of communities and regions, and European integration, from self-administration of Euro-regions to entering the European Community. The basic method is work and positive and peaceful politics. We definitely do not want to yell out who is still to be caught and who is to be destroyed. Who is responsible for what in the past is generally quite clear. Some people are already looking for those responsible for today's errors instead of doing something useful. Yelling will not change our country. It may pacify some passions or compensate for some complexes, and it might give rise to some new passions, too. However, we need energy for our work and not for passions. Besides, if we check who is yelling the most, we usually find that it is someone who was still very active in a different direction in November 1989. Today's loudmouths are often yesterday's loudmouths. That is nothing new.

[Hvizdala] Can you be specific?

[Dienstbier] If you want a concrete example, in drafting the taxation scheme, we will push for tax deductions for those who support culture, science, or who invest in the improvement of the environment. We want to contribute to legislation that would enable a genuine self-administration of communities and regions and provide them with the necessary funds for that purpose; we are forming a counseling service for the communities. We will make sure that our laws and regulations are adjusted to conform to the standards of the European Community and the Council of Europe. We have submitted a proposal for a procedure on drafting constitutions, etc. to other parties and movements.

Rychetsky on Constitutional Talks, Civic Movement

AU2606112391 Prague OBCANSKY DENIK in Czech 22 Jun 91 p 2

["(JC)"-signed report: "Jurisdiction Issue in the Old Manner"]

[Text] Prague—"No legislative political body should include in its election program the goal of breaking up the CSFR. Any steps taken—for example, in one of the legislative organs—that would lead to the adoption of a republican constitution as an independent subject of international law contradict the mandate won by these parties in elections and are not legitimate," said Civic Movement Deputy Chairman Pavel Rychetsky at yesterday's regular briefing.

He added that no legislative body is entitled to break up the CSFR, but only the people of this state in a referendum, whose draft is in the Federal Assembly; however this draft has not yet been included in the Chamber of People's agenda.

P. Rychetsky labelled the subsequent debates in the two national councils—where there are greater differences in opinions than in the Federal Assembly—as a handicap to the Kromeriz [constitutional] talks. He said: "We will appeal to both national councils not to invalidate the results of the talks by tabling questions that have already been closed," and he added that the responsibility should be borne by the representatives of the bodies that participated in the talks.

P. Rychetsky indicated that the disputed spheres of jurisdiction are communications (networks, water supply

system, etc.), electric power production, and the financial system, for which the Christian Democratic Movement demands the establishment of two banks of issue.

Apropos Igor Nemec's election as minister of control, Civic Movement Republican Council Secretary Lubor Kinst said that by his election the agreement reached in Lany has been fulfilled.

When asked about Prime Minister Petr Pithart's resignation as Civic Movement deputy chairman, P. Rychetsky said that the prime minister—in the letter in which he presents I. Nemec as the minister—makes this step on the condition that it will be approved by the Civic Movement Presidium, by which he makes his Civic Movement membership plain.

VPN Slovak Council Issues Appeal

AU2606122691 Bratislava VEREJNOST in Slovak 24 Jun 91 p 2

[Public Against Violence, VPN, movement Slovak Council appeal; place and date not given: "An Appeal to Slovak Citizens"]

[Text] For more than 70 years we have been living in the common state of the Slovaks and Czechs. We have established natural economic, cultural, and also family links that have become a part of our everyday life.

We know that the common state had a number of flaws. Today, when we have a unique historical opportunity to repair everything that the previous regime debased and devalued in the relations between the Czechs and Slovaks, a number of politicians are raising voices and demands calling for the discontinuation of our coexistence in the Federation. Slogans appear, the real content of which is deliberately concealed in mist. The word confederation means a lose union of states, and in our case it presumes the breakup of our existing common state. Slovakia as a subject of international law means an independent state.

We consider such a course of action as irresponsible toward you, the Slovak citizens. In fact, there are two possibilities—a common democratic state or its breakup. Any attempt to create something else than a federation means the cessation of the common state. It is also necessary to say openly that some politicians calling for Slovakia's separation are guided by a mere desire to satisfy their own power interests.

Citizens of Slovakia! In the first free elections one year ago, you gave your votes to legislative deputies. You gave your votes to the deputies so that they would fulfill election programs that you agreed with. However, not one of you has given his vote to deputies with the purpose of breaking up Czechoslovakia.

We appeal to everyone who wants to live in the common state to add his signature to this appeal.

Declaration Published

AU2606180391 Bratislava VEREJNOST in Slovak 24 Jun 91 p 2

[Conclusions reached at the all-Slovak conference of the Public Against Violence movement]

[Text] The conference of the Public Against Violence movement [VPN] took place on 22 June during the renewal of VPN activity after the separation of the Movement For a Democratic Slovakia and the related political crisis in Slovakia.

The VPN still bears responsibility for the realization of the government program despite the fact that—as a consequence of the establishment of the new movement—the political spectrum has been significantly shifted to the left and the forces pushing unequivocally for the federative set-up of our state, democracy, and market [economy] have been weakened. The VPN, together with its coalition partners, has formed the Slovak Republic government. Its new work-style concentrates, above all, on solutions to specific factual problems. In legislative activity, the VPN and coalition partners assert the policy of constructive support for the government program and for passing basic laws allowing [the establishment of] a prosperous democratic society.

The VPN conference states that its participants confirm their unequivocal orientation toward an open society, to include a law-abiding state, parliamentary democracy, and development of autonomy. In the economic sphere, this means a free market—only its functioning ensures prosperity and, as a consequence, social security. It does not omit ethical considerations, environmental protection, or progress in education and culture. These principles are the best national program for the Slovak Republic's citizens.

The conference participants confirmed their interest in the transformation of the movement into a party organized in a modern way.

The VPN conference recommended that the materials and contributed papers become the basis for discussion within the movement and the basis for the preparation of basic documents for the VPN Republic Assembly.

The participants in the VPN conference also made a number of recommendations to the VPN Slovak Council:

1. To appoint the VPN Slovak Council's group of experts for
- Political strategy and shaping the political profile;
- Organizational setup;
- Economic and social reform;
- Cooperation with social organizations;
- Foreign policy;
- Information and publicity policy;
- Legislative issues;
- Preparing and conducting the election campaign;
- State administration, autonomy, and communal policy;
- Defense and security policy;
- Financial security of the movement and administration of its property.

2. To establish the VPN Slovak Council's working groups for drafting the program, statuses, and the theses of the election program that will be discussed at the VPN Republic Assembly in the fall.

3. To reorganize the staff of the VPN Coordinating Center with professionals for maximum effectiveness with these tasks, to train managers for district organizations of the movement, and to elaborate the concept for the information network of the movement and its subsequent implementation.

The participants in the VPN conference—representatives of the clubs from all over Slovakia, Slovak National Council deputies, Federal Assembly deputies, and members of government—appeal to the government and citizens and call for cooperation in asserting the ideas of the Federation, a law-abiding state, and a market economy. Only in this manner will we be able to build a prosperous and democratic Slovakia.

In Liptovsky Mikulas, 22 June 1991.

VPN Slovak Council Chairman on Political Aims

AU2606173391 Bratislava NARODNA OBRODA in Slovak 24 Jun 91 p 3

[Jan Repka report: "They Are Not Renouncing Their Responsibility"]

[Text] Liptovsky Mikulas—Jozef Kucerak, Public Against Violence [VPN] movement Slovak Council chairman, recalled the VPN movement's initial aims and their fulfillment. "When we won the elections," he said, "we did not promise any miracles. We were—and still are—in favor of transformation because Slovakia has a chance. The citizens do not need cheap promises, but a clear policy, stability, and the certainty that they are continuing in a direction away from real socialism."

The VPN still sees the only road toward a prosperous society in asserting the principles of a market mechanism, in parliamentary democracy, and in a federative arrangement for Czechoslovakia. Only political stability and a functioning economy within the Federation will provide, according to the movement's supporters, real possibilities for guaranteeing social certainties and citizens' individual freedoms. However, the state should not present certainties to citizens; it should create conditions and scope for capable and initiative people who will seek them themselves. Therefore, the movement's members place great emphasis on small and medium-sized enterprises and, for this reason, a great deal of criticism was leveled at the course of small-scale privatization.

Peter Zajac evaluated the fulfillment of the Chance For Slovakia program. The VPN—as the main force in the government coalition—deliberately took on demanding tasks, although it realized that the successes would consist more of creating conditions and starting points for economic reform than of real tangible results. He emphasized the part VPN deputies and deputies' clubs had played in adopting many new laws and in initiating activity in the government, in the Slovak legislature, and in the Federal Assembly. For example, in drafting the Document on Human Rights, the language law, the jurisdiction law, the constitutions for the joint federative state....he expressed his dissatisfaction with the adoption of the law on state administration and self-government which does not enable towns and communities to directly shape their own policy. Therefore, the VPN will strive to have it changed. The movement is also preparing its own draft for an administrative analysis of Slovakia taking its historic and economic development into consideration. This will soon be presented for public discussion. Peter Zajac described the implementation of a restrictive policy as the movement's success in the economic sphere. This policy is activating Slovakia's, to date, hidden potential and—along with privatization—is leading toward economic prosperity and the market economy. He also mentioned the great changes in education and culture.

Marcel Stryko made a speech containing a comprehensive report on the movement's political profile. He spoke about the problems associated with the gradual increase in national elements in a revolution of the civic type, with the weakening of civic liberalism, with ideological disputes among individual functionaries, and with various opinions about the course of economic reform and the constitutional and legal arrangement which finally led to a split in the movement. The VPN wants to continue to be the guarantor of society's transformation from real socialism to open democracy. However, it is essential to change the movement's organizational structure, to strengthen it, to increase the share of personal responsibility, and to precisely determine its members' obligations. The profile of the future party along with draft amendments to its articles—submitted to the conference's participants by Juraj Flamik—were the issues discussed most often.

On 23 June the VPN Slovak Council discussed and adopted recommendations from the VPN conference platform.

Prime Minister Antall on G-7 Summit

AU2606161291 Budapest NEPSZABADSAG in Hungarian 25 Jun 91 pp 1, 5

[Interview with Prime Minister Jozsef Antall by Sandor Stuber on 24 June; place not given: "Jozsef Antall to Visit Germany"—first paragraph is NEPSZABADSAG introduction]

[Text] "Should an invitation arrive from the organizers of the London summit of the seven most industrialized countries, I would willingly travel to the British capital, along with [Polish President] Lech Walesa and [CSFR President] Vaclav Havel, to hold talks on Western support for the East and Central European region," Prime Minister Jozsef Antall said in an interview with MTI correspondent Sandor Stuber on 24 June. The prime minister also said that German Chancellor Helmut Kohl had assured him in their Monday morning telephone conversation that support for Hungary and the other countries in the region would definitely be on the agenda at the G-7 talks.

[Stuber] What was your reaction to [U.S. adviser] Brzezinski's proposal that an invitation should be sent to the representatives of three Central and Eastern European states?

[Antall] I agree with Brzezinski's proposal. It is of the utmost importance that, besides the support for the Soviet Union, the issue of support for the whole East and Central European region figure on the agenda of the London summit. I would like to call attention to the fact that the invitation for Mikhail Gorbachev aroused a debate in itself; therefore, it is not at all certain that the three countries in Brzezinski's proposal will have the opportunity to be represented at the summit on a presidential and prime ministerial level. All three countries are seeing to the preliminaries of the summit—they are even working in coordination—and we are prepared to take part in the summit if the opportunity arises. Chancellor Kohl just telephoned me recently and assured me that in London, the issue of support for the countries of Eastern and Central Europe would definitely be treated in the same way as the issue of support for the Soviet Union. We agreed that I should make a short private visit to Germany before the summit, at Helmut Kohl's invitation.

On the basis of our telephone conversation and on the basis of other factors, too, I think it is already clear to all the summit's participants that it would be unseemly to back the Soviet Union in a way that would be detrimental to those countries that have already achieved a certain amount of progress in their drive toward democratic transformation. In fact, these countries fully agree with the West supporting the Soviet Union because they hope that Western aid will help the Soviet Union pay its debts and fulfill its contractual obligations. At the same time, it would enable the Soviet Union to go on purchasing goods from economies whose structures have been established and conserved according to the Soviet Union's needs. Incidentally, the "Visegrad three" [Hungary, Poland, and the CSFR] form a separate group because these three countries are either members or permanent guests of the Council of Europe, and they are holding association talks with the EC.

[Stuber] These last few days, the economic talks concerning the Soviet troop withdrawal have been a hotly debated domestic event in Hungary. The progress of these talks, the many "unexpected turns" took several people by surprise. How would you qualify the talks so far? Do you think that an agreement might be reached soon?

[Antall] During the last visit to Hungary by Konstantin Katushev, Soviet minister of foreign economic relations, we agreed that the talks would be conducted on two levels. The task of the experts—Viktor Shilov [former commander of the Soviet Southern Army Group] and Antal Annus [state secretary at the Hungarian Ministry of Defense]—is to estimate the value of facilities built by the Soviets in Hungary and assess the damages caused and debts incurred by the Soviets during their 46-year stay. Ministerial talks will be continued afterwards. It has to be stated that the Soviet Union has carried out its troop withdrawal. At the same time, we are still waiting for a financial agreement. International agreements and certain bilateral agreements signed in the past cannot be ignored. We are definitely of the opinion that we need exact data to conclude a financial agreement. We want to base this data on objective and fair measurements.

An anti-Soviet attitude in the talks is out of the question. Indeed, the Soviet Union continues to be our neighbor, we attach great importance to our presence in the Soviet market, and we are making efforts to establish good ties with the Republics and their populations. The Soviet position is all the more surprising as there was no bilateral legal or international legal basis for the Soviets staying in Hungary after the signing of the Austrian State Agreement in 1955 and up until the conclusion of the Hungarian-Soviet intergovernmental agreement in 1957. This is something that has not been mentioned so far. Yet this period includes the 1956 revolution and the ensuing Soviet intervention.

[Stuber] What will happen if we fail to come to a bilateral agreement on financial claims?

[Antall] I hope that we will be able to come to an agreement. If the Soviet Union still questions the legitimacy of Hungarian claims, then we will gladly accept an international organization as arbiter.

[Stuber] The other political sensation of this weekend was a certain provincial general meeting where some sharp criticisms were leveled at Jozsef Antall. For example, according to the former chairman of the 1956 Greater Budapest Workers' Council, you were "a protege of the Communist regime."

[Antall] I have great respect for Sandor Racz's activities during 1956, and he should be given due respect for the

tests that he was put to after the revolution. However, I am sincerely taken aback by his ignorance. Which of the former regime's actions does he refer to in the statement you just quoted? Is he referring to the fact that I was arrested after 1956 and questioned by the Hungarians and the KGB? Or is he referring to the fact that as a consequence of my actions during the revolution, I lost my job, I was excluded from my profession, there was a ban on my publications up until 1963, and I was not granted a passport to the West until 1974? I do not want to deal with these issues at length; anybody can check my curriculum vitae.

[Stuber] At the same general meeting, [Smallholders Party representative] Jozsef Torgyan challenged you to a confrontation on television, where your past would be examined together in public. What is your reaction to this challenge?

[Antall] Jozsef Torgyan is a jurist, and he knows perfectly well that he can say anything he likes and refer to anything he wants. The prime minister, on the other hand, is bound by laws that prohibit him from saying everything that he knows on personal issues. That is why I do not want to take part in a television debate. However, I will gladly submit myself to the kind of examination that a relevant legislative committee is carrying out on both of us at the moment, and I will gladly contribute to the publication of the committee's conclusions.

Incidentally, in connection with Jozsef Torgyan, I would like to point out that people are starting to forget that Torgyan personally requested this examination of his past in a letter dated 13 May. I replied to his letter on 27 May. Torgyan received my reply on 31 May and sent it back to me on the same day, formulating his further requests. In a letter on 3 June, I acknowledged the receipt of his new request, and I called his attention to a certain sentence that had appeared in the press about him, a sentence that I considered to be untrue. Jozsef Torgyan subsequently changed his mind and refused to open the detailed reply that he had requested—he also stated this in public. On the basis of the laws that bind me, I cannot say anything else about this affair. In the same way, I did not make any remarks about certain individuals to the Assembly's National Security Committee either.

[Stuber] It seems that Jozsef Torgyan might become the number one leader of the Independent Smallholders Party [FKgP] this weekend [29 and 30 June]. What expectations do you have concerning the FKgP meeting? Could you envisage cooperation in a coalition with an FKgP led by Torgyan?

[Antall] I have not interfered with FKgP affairs in the past, and I will not do so in the future. I took part in the preparatory work for the party's restructuring, but as a founding member of the Hungarian Democratic Forum [MDF], I did not become a member of the FKgP. I cannot say anything but this: I hope that the party leadership will adopt a policy according to which the settling of Hungary's property relations will take place as soon as possible through the creation of a truly modern system that is based on private farming [farmergazdasag]. The FKgP's 60-year long history prevents any extreme or demagogic influences from impregnating the party in the long run. All three coalition parties represent a common intellectual basis, and they are all active in the same international and European organizations. A party with a great tradition like the FKgP must care about its international prestige. Naturally, this is inseparable from its role in Hungarian domestic policy and from its commitments to the Hungarian people. I do not think that any significant anti-coalition changes will take place in the FKgP leadership. I find it much more likely that the general assembly will give its mandates to a leadership that will definitely maintain the FKgP in the center, a leadership that will primarily bear pan-national goals in mind (this would reflect the opinion of the masses that stand behind the FKgP). The raising of personal issues and occasional objections to individual government members (the "recall initiatives") come under the freedom of speech and the framework of democracy. At the same time, all this should not be confused with a radio program called "Listeners' Choice."

[Stuber] Following the expert negotiations that lasted for several weeks, the six-party political coordination talks will resume on 25 June. Given that practically no agreement has been reached so far, we might be entitled to ask whether the coordination forum will peter out?

[Antall] I hope not. Personally, I think that it is important for these talks to continue. We should have the opportunity to elaborate long-term national strategies in certain areas, to complete political preparations on specific interest representation issues, and to agree on certain questions where we all believe that a quick legislative decision is required. The Federation of Young Democrats' invitation did me a great honor, and I shall be taking part at the Tuesday meeting in my capacity as prime minister and as a neutral moderator (not as the chairman of the MDF). Nevertheless, let no one doubt that an agreement can only be reached with the approval of the coalition parties' legislative factions, and this approval also needs to be reflected in government decisions, of course. A decision that would limit the constitutional rights of the government or the Assembly is out of the question. That is why these coordination talks cannot act as a national roundtable (unlike the 1989 roundtable, which operated in the "shadow" of an Assembly whose political legitimacy was questionable).

SZDSZ Representative on Grand Coalition Theory

AU2106121791 Budapest MAGYAR HIRLAP in Hungarian 19 Jun 91 p 5

["F.A."-signed interview with Matyas Eorsi, executive member of the Alliance of Free Democrats; place and

date not given: "Eorsi: The Coalition Could Fall Apart Any Minute"—first two paragraphs are MAGYAR HIRLAP introduction]

[Text] "The inadequate composition of this government coalition should be replaced by a grand coalition between the Hungarian Democratic Forum and the Alliance of Free Democrats"—this is what Viktor Orban, parliamentary faction leader of the Federation of Young Democrats [FIDESZ] told MAGYAR HIRLAP on 17 June. Prime Minister Jozsef Antall stated last week during his talks with county representatives of the Independent Smallholders Party [FKgP] that there were other candidates for the government coalition apart from the FKgP.

We asked Matyas Eorsi whether a grand coalition stood any realistic chances. We also asked him what he thought of the current coalition's situation.

[Eorsi] The strongest winning party at the elections decides who should be invited for coalition talks. Before the elections, the Alliance of Free Democrats [SZDSZ] stated (and we still maintain this today) that the country was in such a serious situation that a grand coalition might be justified under specific circumstances. However, there is no point in talking about a grand coalition as long as the governing parties fail to recognize there is a crisis in Hungary. Taking that into consideration, there is no possible reason for a grand coalition at this point. The situation is further complicated by the fact that ideological differences between the Hungarian Democratic Forum [MDF] and the SZDSZ have grown since the 1990 elections.

[MAGYAR HIRLAP] Has the SZDSZ not even thought about a grand coalition in the recent past?

[Eorsi] Given that our domestic policy situation did not give rise to any such possibilities, none of our bodies have discussed this issue. Let us return to my opinion of the current coalition's situation: I believe that the coalition could fall apart any minute. The main reason for this is the FKgP's extreme and implacable position (if you like) on the compensation issue. Under such circumstances, Prime Minister Jozsef Antall has to decide whether he is prepared to govern in a minority, or whether he wants to find a replacement for the FKgP.

[MAGYAR HIRLAP] Could a minority government provide a solution to Hungary's current situation?

[Eorsi] Clearly, in such a situation, the parties who remain in the opposition and the leading force in the coalition have to talk about the appropriate conditions for minority governing. I think that a minority government is definitely practicable if rules are appropriately outlined. Of course, a minority government can be used for short-term crisis management on the condition that new elections are called after a certain period of time. However, if Jozsef Antall is not prepared to form a minority government (and several signs indicate this) then a successor will have to be found to the FKgP.

Party Leaders Assess Coalition Prospects

AU2606102991 Budapest MAGYAR HIRLAP in Hungarian 24 June 91 p 5

[Interview with Ivan Vitanyi, president of the National Council of the Hungarian Socialist Party, and Ivan Peto, faction leader of the Alliance of Free Democrats, by Zoltan Lovas; place and date not given: "Occasionally, We Should Talk to Each Other"—first paragraph is MAGYAR HIRLAP introduction]

[Text] Ivan Vitanyi recently published an article attracting great attention to the long-term cooperation between the Hungarian Socialist Party [MSZP] and the Alliance of Free Democrats [SZDSZ] and on the need to cooperate. Ivan Vitanyi and Ivan Peto, executive member of the SZDSZ, together reflected upon this idea at the request of MAGYAR HIRLAP.

[Lovas] Do you agree with the notion explained by Ivan Vitanyi, namely that the SZDSZ and the MSZP are interdependent in the long run?

[Peto] I do not feel that the time is right for the opposition to unite, that is, to form a unified opposition policy. I also do not agree with the way Ivan Vitanyi formed his opinion on the government coalition. It seems to me that the policy of the Hungarian Democratic Forum [MDF], that keeps looking toward the Horthy era, and which is most spectacular for the outside world, is unacceptable and alien for a considerable part of the MDF membership. Since the article talks about the ways the SZDSZ could increase its base of voters, we must definitely remember that there is a large group of voters who do not feel nostalgic toward the Horthy era; therefore, they do not like this trait of the MDF—even though they may not accept the SZDSZ, the MSZP, or the Federation of Young Democrats. This group of voters is approachable. They want a modern Hungary, maybe not entirely on the basis of social or socialist principles, but they certainly do not want a Hungary that functions on a conservative, national, and Christian basis. We should analyze how much MDF's current policy coincides with the ideas of people who voted for the MDF.

[Vitanyi] As far as the timing is concerned, I did not mean that the SZDSZ and the MSZP should start holding joint meetings of leadership right away and that we should have common principles and decisions—not even on a level that exists between the parties of the current coalition. I also do not include only legislative politics in our cooperation, because a common stand is often achieved automatically on various issues without prior arrangement. I can cite the issues of compensation and privatization as examples. If we look at the question of our cooperation in view of the political behavior of the whole society, then it certainly is timely, and we have to respond to it. As for the MDF and the government, I do not think that the MDF can be identified with some kind of Horthyst restoration either. However, a coalition policy could emerge that does not coincide with the modernization ideas mentioned by Ivan Peto; and the

opposition parties could take a common stand against this policy. There is a common intellectual attitude here that can be found somewhere in the area of bourgeois thinking, social democracy, and liberalism. These areas of thought are more interdependent in the conditions of Hungary than in those Western countries where a modern society has already been established. In this situation, it is very timely to have an alternative Hungary to the Hungary and the intellectual attitude that—in this sense—the coalition parties represent. It should be obvious for society that they have to choose between these two alternatives.

[Peto] It seems to me that the MSZP and the SZDSZ address different groups of the electorate, even though these two groups may have many similar values. They also have many differences. I can only see disadvantages in a closer cooperation than the current one. The opposition does not have such an overall cause that requires continuous cooperation between the opposition parties. The current level of legislative cooperation corresponds perfectly to the status of SZDSZ and MDF.

[Lovas] Please talk about the non-practical reasons for your rejection, too....

[Peto] We have to realize that many of the SZDSZ voters think that the MSZP is the party of those people who represent some kind of continuity—although they might have pleasant personalities in their local society, at work, or in the circle of people where they live. That is the reason I find closer cooperation than we presently have in our policies outside the legislature and the local governments unimaginable.

[Lovas] Do you suggest that socially-sensitive people would come together in a common, maturing, modern, and social democratic party, people who are currently affiliated with the MSZP and the SZDSZ, on an electoral basis after being divided along the lines of today's fledgling parties and ideological values?

[Vitanyi] Neither Ivan Peto, nor the SZDSZ are willing to notice the changes that happened within the MSZP. A group has been established in the MSZP who carry the party on their shoulders and who had nothing or very little to do with the old party state. They were not members of the Central Committee, and they were not party functionaries in the counties. This involves some 10,000 to 15,000 people between the ages of 30 and 50, whose behavior, attitude, and way of thinking are not very different from the people the SZDSZ also counts on. These people control the party. Naturally, there are many people in our party who came from the old apparatus, but these were the most honest of them, who can go along even with the SZDSZ in many issues. A solution somewhere between the two parties would be attractive for a considerable number of thinking people. They find the SZDSZ line attractive, and they also see something in the MSZP.... The thing that connects the MSZP and the SZDSZ has a common intellectual aura that can be accepted by the intelligent and thinking people. Obviously, this is not an alliance for elections. We will have quite sharp differences in an election.

[Peto] We do not agree on what views the SZDSZ has of the MSZP. People who determine the SZDSZ' aims can more or less see that the MSZP is dominated by people who represent the most attractive line in the former Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP], and the continuation of this line could even be accepted. These people were not allowed to voice their opinion in the former MSZMP. As a goal, it was acceptable to think that the Kadar regime, which was thought to be bad, should be changed by implementing changes within the MSZMP, and certain social changes should be initiated by exerting influence on the outside from within the MSZMP. In many respects, today the policy of the MSZP is determined by people who represented the reformist line in the MSZMP.... They are not the only people in the MSZP. The MSZP does not represent continuity with the MSZMP through its aims, but through the people in local societies who held various leading positions. In the local societies, the MSZP is the party of these people. The MSZP is spectacularly distinguished from the social democratic parties by having a basis very close to the basis of the former nomenklatura, while the SZDSZ' basis is closer to a social basis with a social democratic character. There is quite a sharp difference between these two groups in Hungary. Hungarian society has quite a lot of repugnance for leaders, and this also has a political tint; it is not manifested only by social classes. We also have other differences, for example, the way the MSZP is linked to the National Association of Trade Unions [MSZOSZ]....

[Vitanyi] It seems to me that we should really talk to each other from time to time. The MSZP did not align itself with the MSZOSZ, but we think that we should cooperate with all kinds of trade unions. We are neutral on the question of how much power the various trade unions will have. As for myself, I am a founding member of the Democratic League of Independent Trade Unions, and I continue to be a member of it.

Parliament Passes Compensation Law

LD2606153791 Budapest MTI in English 1438 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Budapest, June 26 (MTI)—With 187 votes for, 133 against and 6 abstentions, the Compensation Law was passed once and for all by the Hungarian parliament on Wednesday, after being referred back to parliament by the Constitutional Court, with the ruling that several clauses were unconstitutional.

In the course of the voting that lasted for over an hour, MPs cast their votes on amendments in 56 rounds. Parliament has accepted all the motions handed in by the Hungarian Democratic Forum.

The Compensation Law was first enacted by parliament with a 61 percent majority on April 24, 1991. According to the first version, all Hungarian citizens and their

direct descendants, whose property was nationalized without or with very little compensation after June 8, 1949 (the date of the first national assembly following the communist take-over), are entitled to partial compensation. Also eligible for compensation are foreign citizens who were Hungarian citizens at the time when their property was confiscated.

The law had to wait before it could be promulgated however, because Hungarian President Arpad Goncz sought the opinion of the Constitutional Court with regard to four questions, on May 13, 1991. The four question were the following:

Is it constitutional

—That the law provides partial compensation rather than a return of property?

—That it does not deal with injury sustained prior to June 8, 1949?

—That it differentiates according to types of property?

—That it seeks to grant compensation at the expense of local councils and co-operatives? (Compensation coupons could have been used to purchase state or co-operatively-owned flats).

The Constitutional Court answered in the affirmative to the first question, and negatively to the other three, thus enabling the law to be sent back to parliament.

In the new version of the law as well as in the first version, payment will be made in the form of compensation certificates, while the deadline for applications is 90 days after the law takes affect.

The law passed today fixes the limit for 100-percent compensation at 200,000 forints (2,600 dollars) both for land and property. Property and land worth more than this will be only partially compensated on a sliding scale.

However, the possibility of former land-owners receiving full compensation for land up to a value of one million forints—a feature of the original version—still remains, under a system of "entrepreneurial assistance" for which claimants will be eligible provided they undertake to cultivate the land for five years and register themselves as entrepreneurs.

In another important modification the period covered by the law will be extended back from 1949 to 1939, while the new law states that some land currently held by cooperatives will be sold for auction, with only those holding compensation certificate being allowed to bid.

Democratic Forum Leader on Party's Position

AU2106174991 Budapest MAGYAR NEMZET in Hungarian 19 Jun 91 p 6

["I.S."-signed interview with Imre Furmann, deputy chairman of the Hungarian Democratic Forum; place and date not given: "Is the Forum Decreasing?—From Declaration to Power"—first two paragraphs are MAGYAR NEMZET introduction]

[Text] A report was recently published in MAGYAR NEMZET on the dwindling membership of the Forum. For example, in Tiszadob, 30 members of the Hungarian Democratic Forum [MDF] left the organization together and formed the Tiszadob Friendship Society, which has now become the local organization of the National Democratic Federation. Istvan Bugya made the following statement on the reasons people in Tiszadob left the MDF: "We became disappointed with the MDF. We felt that the MDF's presidium and directorate, and even its legislative faction leaders took a right turn and, by doing so, they deviated from the aims set forth in the founding document drawn up in Lakitelek. We sent a letter to [Prime Minister] Jozsef Antall and the presidium about the reasons for our decision, and they replied to us. However, neither the letter sent from the prime minister's secretariat, nor our conversation with Imre Furmann, which lasted for several hours, could convince us that the MDF was continuing its work in the spirit of Lakitelek...."

Our correspondent went to see Imre Furmann in connection with the news. He said the details of the article were "half truths", because a number of Tiszadob MDF members had already left the organization earlier, in November 1990. However, the MDF in Tiszadob continues to survive and function in spite of all this.

[Furmann] Therefore, those people who joined Pozsgay's organization already left our organization eight months ago.

[MAGYAR NEMZET] You visited Tiszadob. What did you discuss with the local people?

[Furmann] I went to Tiszadob at the invitation of the Friendship Society to clear up our possible misunderstandings. People in Tiszadob are my old acquaintances; I respect them and esteem them, and I am sorry that they left our organization. I met Istvan Bugya and other members of the leadership and tried to clarify our misunderstandings. Unfortunately, I did not succeed. Listening to their reasoning and being aware of our party's policy, I feel I could not have succeeded.

[MAGYAR NEMZET] How do you explain that?

[Furmann] All parties undergo tests in real life, when those who share power reveal their actual program after the initial declarations. Some of our members are unable to accept practical politics because they prefer other ways of practicing politics. It seems to be easy to publish slogans that sound good or to quote from the works of great poets, as we have done. It is harder to implement a practical program successfully than to quote slogans. Thus, the individual has to decide and choose whether he can tackle the road to achieve that.

[MAGYAR NEMZET] How much truth is there in the news that MDF membership has greatly decreased?

[Furmann] MDF membership is not decreasing, although it is not increasing, either. If we examine the other parties in Hungarian political life, we can see that the MDF is in a good position. We have a functioning membership, although it is true that their activity has decreased somewhat. Just like the other parties, the MDF has also only reached the middle stage in the process of becoming a true party. This process of change takes a long time, and it has some unavoidable stages. The MDF is also in a more difficult situation because it also operates certain bodies that participate in exercising power every day.

[MAGYAR NEMZET] Is it true that the MDF's current leadership has deviated from the aims that were laid down in the founding document in Lakitelek?

[Furmann] If you compare our Lakitelek aims and the 1989 MDF program to the Assembly's legislation, you will see that there are not many differences. The existing differences result from our governing in a coalition—we have a multiparty system. Economic conditions also influence politics. In my opinion, if a party can implement at least 70 percent of its promises, it is a good proportion.

[MAGYAR NEMZET] How much truth is there in the accusation that you are shifting to the right?

[Furmann] The MDF does not have a right wing, and especially not a left wing. The MDF is a collective party; I would call it a center party, which is able to integrate various interests and trends. To get back to your question, the MDF is "right-wing," to a certain extent, if we think about the kind of historical values it represents and the way it ensures the continuity of certain principles. We say that we are Europeans by being Hungarians. We have to accept that we are right-wing in this sense, but in no other respect.

Oil Consumption, Imports Set To Decline

LD2406172391 Budapest MTI in English 0932 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Text] Budapest, June 24 (MTI)—This year Hungary will need to buy 5.2 million tonnes of oil from abroad, as compared to 6.2-6.3 million in previous years, MTI was informed at the national oil and gas trust.

The downward trend in imports was due to the falling domestic demand for oil products. Last year's consumption of 2,500 million litres of petrol will probably decrease to 2,000 million litres, and that of fuel oil from 3,000 million litres to 2,500 million.

Lower consumption will curtail budget revenues, given that petrol prices incorporate 33 forints of consumption tax per litre, and fuel oil 16 forints per litre. On the other hand, the falling demand will result in considerable hard-currency savings. The previous estimate was for oil costing 24 dollars per barrel and imports totalling some 6 million tonnes, which would have amounted to 1,200 million dollars. Because world market prices have turned out to be lower than expected, as has consumption, this year's oil bill is expected to be in the region of 800 million dollars.

More than half of the oil comes from the Soviet Union, and approximately one million tons from Arab and African countries.

Bank Official Discusses Bank Stock Ownership

AU2506085991 Budapest NEPSZABADSAG in Hungarian 21 Jun 91 p 3

[Interview with Imre Tarafas, first deputy chairman of the Hungarian National Bank, by Maria Lakatos in Geneva; date not given: "Conference of Bankers in Geneva"—first four paragraphs are NEPSZABADSAG introduction]

[Text] The financiers of Europe are preparing for 1992 and are planning the establishment of a supra-national central bank, while the leaders of the Russian Republic's Central Bank are trying to find a way to control the constant multiplying of local financial institutions.

These two extremes were mentioned at the two-day banking seminar in Geneva that began on 20 June, in connection with the need to constantly modernize information systems.

Imre Tarafas reported on the development of the Hungarian banking system. He also discussed the present state of the Hungarian economy, saying that the deficit in the current payment balance is expected to be less than the planned level of $1.2 billion.

During a break in the conference, Imre Tarafas gave an interview to our correspondent:

[Lakatos] Have you formed some kind of consensus about when and how much Hungarian bank stock can be purchased by foreign investors?

[Tarafas] We do not have any idea; we have not even started debating on this issue. In fact, there is nothing to discuss until the fate of the dubious loans that the banks inherited is settled. According to the Economic Cabinet's decision, the budget will guarantee loans up to 10 billion forints, which alleviates the situation of the banks. After this, bank balances that satisfy international norms can be prepared, making the Hungarian financial institutions competitive. However, we can hardly sell bank stock until the Assembly passes the law on banks because the foreign investors want to know the rules.

[Lakatos] According to some experts, it would be dangerous to give too large a share to the foreign banks.

[Tarafas] We have to remember that people can freely choose between banks, and if a customer is not satisfied with one bank, he can transfer his account to another. This problem has another side: Will excessive foreign ownership of the big banks endanger compliance with

our monetary policy and the rules on banking security? We also have to think about that. At any rate, we are not considering any concessions to foreigners who buy shares in our banks. I also think it expedient to keep a significant percentage of state ownership.

Population Close to Limits of Tolerance on Prices

AU2606134691

[Editorial Report] NEPSZABADSAG in Hungarian on 24 June on pages 1 and 5 carries a 1,200-word report by Geza Lajos Nagy on the results of a Hungarian Gallup Institute survey on people's attitude toward price rises, under the headline: "Standard of Living, Prices, Tolerance."

According to the survey, "more than 90 percent of the population experienced a 'steep' price rise in 1990, and nobody expects increases of income to compensate for the increase in prices in 1991." The survey also found that half the population expects a moderate increase in prices, and 40 percent expect sharply rising prices this year. The report concludes that "75 percent of the population do not think the government does everything in its power to stop the price rises." The report states that people with the least schooling and in the oldest age group approve of the government's measures to curb inflation more than other groups do.

As for living standards, the survey shows that "half the population thinks their living standard is on a medium level, one-third (37 percent) think it is bad, and one-tenth (9 percent) think their living standard is very bad." The survey also states that "people who live in villages or who have a low level of schooling consider the situation to be somewhat better than the average." The survey concludes that "the way people assess their living standard is determined by their trust in the government. Those who have faith in the government have a more positive view of the present and the future than those who do not trust the government."

The Gallup Institute made an attempt to establish where people's tolerance level is at the moment on a scale of one to 10, 10 indicating the point where the increase of prices exceeds people's endurance. The survey found that "one-fifth of the population think the Hungarian people have reached the limit of tolerance and another fifth think that people have come very near this level." The average level of tolerance was calculated at 8.08, showing a decreasing tolerance level.

U.S. Government Promises New Trade Preferences

LD2406201591 Budapest MTI in English 1005 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Text] Budapest, June 24, 1991 (MTI-ECONEWS)—The U.S. Government promised Hungary new trade preferences last week when Ferenc Somogyi, Hungarian state secretary for foreign affairs, was in Washington for talks with government officials.

A spokesman for the Hungarian Ministry of International Economic Relations told ECONEWS that the exact nature of the preferences was not known yet. He said that Hungary had repeatedly urged the U.S. to raise textile and steel quotas and allow the import of Hungarian sugar and cheese made of cow's milk.

Hungary is also moving for extending the GSP [Gross Social Product] to wines and canned products. In addition, it wants the U.S. to remove Hungary from the list of countries under communist influence and without a market economy. It is hoped the fact that every last Soviet soldier has now left the country will help remove Hungary's name from the COCOM list, too.

Last year, Hungary's trade with the U.S. neared 600 million USD. About 60 percent of the 1 billion USD of foreign capital invested in Hungary has come from U.S. companies. The largest investors include General Electric, Ford, and General Motors.

Agriculture Minister on Trade With Ukraine

AU2406194191 Budapest MAGYAR HIRLAP in Hungarian 21 Jun 91 p 3

[Interview with Agriculture Minister Elemer Gergatz by Sara Pogany; place and date not given: "Hungarian Food to the Ukraine"—first paragraph is MAGYAR HIRLAP introduction]

[Text] The primary point of the recent agreement signed between Elemer Gergatz and A.N. Tkachenko, Ukrainian state minister for food industry and agricultural policy, is that the major mining and industrial centers of the Ukraine will be supplied by Hungarian food in the near future. We asked Elemer Gergatz about details and about the "attempts to dismiss him" from his position as Minister of Agriculture.

[Pogany] Mr. Gergatz! According to information from the Smallholders' Party, some members of your party will demand your dismissal from your position as minister at the upcoming general meeting of your party presidium. What is your opinion about this?

[Gergatz] I also heard such rumors, but I do not think that this issue will be discussed at the general meeting. Nevertheless, if this appears on the agenda, I would like to draw the attention of the people who think this way to the fact that the president of the republic appointed me to this position with the approval of the prime minister. Therefore, the general meeting can propose my dismissal but, when this proposal is viewed by the prime minister, coalition talks would be required. Personally, I am much more concerned about the fact that, because of extremist elements, the Smallholders' Party will disintegrate the same way as the Social Democratic Party did, and it will fail to fulfill its mission derived from its historic past. Those people who are interested in disintegrating the party are obviously also aware of the inherent dangers to the coalition and the ability to consistently govern the country.

[Pogany] You returned from the Ukraine yesterday. What was the goal of your visit?

[Gergatz] I paid a visit to the Ukraine at the invitation of the Ukrainian Ministry of Agriculture. Bilateral relations improved considerably after the meeting between our two presidents. We discussed several issues with Agriculture Minister Tkachenko. We agreed to export Hungarian foodstuffs to the major industrial centers in the Ukraine. I asked my colleague to present their demands in writing within two weeks, so we are able to start sending agricultural products as soon as possible. In addition, we also expect serious cooperation in four different areas. We can cooperate in the form of mixed enterprises in the mutual production and supply of sowing seed, primarily of corn, sunflower, wheat, and some vegetables. Animal husbandry is the other area of possible cooperation. It is well known that the sperm of the Hungarian bull is of high biological quality, and the Ukrainians would like to improve their stock of cattle to improve the quality of milk and meat. The Ukrainians are also interested in the Hungarian food packing industry, because they do not have processing lines. However, they also want this cooperation in the form of a mixed enterprise. We also agreed on the export of Hungarian pesticides to the Ukraine.

[Pogany] What did the Ukrainians offer in exchange?

[Gergatz] It seems almost certain that barter trade will play a role in the initial period. They offered tractors, small agricultural machines, and fuel, like oil, wood, and motor gasoline. Thus, the private producers will also be able to purchase the imported MTZ tractors at a reasonable price, instead of the Western brand, which costs millions. These tractors can be used for agricultural work on 1,000 to 1,200 hectares, as well as on 15 acres. I think Hungary is not in a position to show off.

[Pogany] Apparently, ways to solve the milk problem were also discussed at yesterday's government session. What is the essence of this problem?

[Gergatz] Every producer who slaughters his cattle and agrees in writing not to replace them for three years, and to reduce milk production by 15 percent—in other words, he sticks to the limit of 4,500 liters—will receive 10,000 forints for every slaughtered animal.

[Pogany] Do you think that this sum is too small?

[Gergatz] Of course I do. However, we must admit that this is still better than nothing. Even if symbolically, we somehow compensate the producer.

Foreign Committee Official Meets Romania's Roman

AU2606104391 Budapest NEPSZABADSAG in Hungarian 25 Jun 91 pp 1, 3

[Interview with Gyorgy Csoti, deputy head of the Foreign Affairs Committee, by Csaba Nagy; place and date not given: "Provisional Hungarian Consulate in Marosvasarhely?—first paragraph is NEPSZABADSAG introduction]

[Text] [Romanian Prime Minister] Petre Roman is a European character. He speaks several foreign languages fluently, behaves elegantly, and he is an excellent negotiating partner. He reacted angrily only when I brought up the problems of the Hungarian national minority in Romania—Gyorgy Csoti says, who spoke with Petre Roman on the occasion of a European regional conference held in Liechtenstein. According to Csoti, Petre Roman reacted favorably to the proposal to open a provisional Hungarian Consulate in Marosvasarhely [Tirgu Mures] in the near future, in view of the "aversion of the population in Kolozsvar." Gyorgy Csoti granted an interview to NEPSZABADSAG on his return from this conference:

[Csoti] I consider it extremely important that our meeting took place in a friendly atmosphere. Discussing the domestic political situation in Romania, Petre Roman told me that he expected the new constitution to be adopted in September and to finally hold local government elections in October. As is well known, the draft constitution contained a stipulation according to which parties would not be allowed to form in the future on an ethnic basis, and this would lead to the disappearance of the Democratic Association of Hungarians in Romania [RMDSZ]. Petre Roman firmly calmed me by saying that there would be no such stipulation in the constitution.

We also discussed essential issues and tried to find solutions. First, I brought up the issue of the Hungarian Consulate in Romania. In his reply, Petre Roman admitted that he personally agreed with the January 1990 agreement on reopening the Hungarian Consulate, but the population of Kolozsvar [Cluj] continues to oppose the idea. It was shocking for me to hear from a prime minister that the population of a city does not agree with the opening of a general consulate, even if we are talking about a Hungarian Consulate.

[Nagy] Did you ask him about the source of this information?

[Csoti] Of course. I told him that either I misunderstood him, or he was misinformed. Here came my first surprise: He told me that neither of the above is true. This is the reality. I told him that only the extremist organization Vatra Romaneasca could stir up such a mood. Here came my new surprise: Petre Roman defended Vatra Romaneasca. He called it a sober and moderate movement and, although it contains an extremist group, such extremist groups are also operating in Hungary, and our task is to take a stand against such groups. According to Petre Roman, the population in Kolozsvar seems to fear that the Hungarian Consulate General there would become the source of anti-Romanian ideas in Transylvania. Although he said that he was not personally afraid

of this danger, he told me that "it would take a long time until they succeed in convincing the population in Kolozsvar."

[Nagy] Does this mean that you have given up reopening the Hungarian Consulate General there?

[Csoti] We are only talking about a delay. I proposed to open a provisional consulate in Marosvasarhely until they can convince the population in Kolozsvar. With a smile, Petre Roman called my proposal an excellent idea and promised to examine this possibility after his return home.

Petre Roman, whose behavior is quite European, only became emotional and raised his voice when I told him, hopefully, that the problems facing the Hungarian national minority in Transylvania would disappear with the accelerating social and political reforms and the broadening of democracy in Romania. For example, the right to study from elementary school to university in one's own mother tongue and the problem of television programs in Hungarian, which first were reduced by half and then switched to a second channel that cannot be seen in Transylvania. Here he interrupted me by nervously telling me not to continue because, this way, we would not be able to continue a dialogue on building friendship, because, in his view, these were issues that we should not deal with, and because "those people are Romanians, even if they speak Hungarian."

[Nagy] Did concrete results emerge in the course of other meetings?

[Csoti] With Mr. Meri, the Estonian foreign minmister, we agreed to mutually encourage the opening of a national center in Tallin and Budapest, and on behalf of the Hungarian Democratic Forum I invited Mrs. Prunskiene to study the transformation of the farmers and Hungarian agriculture in general. Mrs. Prunskiene is interested in the Hungarian agricultural experience.

Trade Talks Held With Germany in Miskolc

LD2506002591 Budapest MTI in English 1604 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Text] Budapest, June 24 (MTI)—The united Germany became the most important economic partner for Hungary during 1990. Bilateral trade between the two countries was 6,500 million DM [marks], with German exports totalling 3,200 million and Hungarian exports 3,300 million DM.

Hungarian exports showed a marked increase, with 24 per cent more Hungarian goods sold on German markets in 1990 than in 1988. The tendency has proved that Hungarian economy was able to adapt to the conditions of the German market, Eva Dude, head of the Budapest office of the Association of German Chambers of Industry and Commerce commented on the economic ties linking the two countries on Monday.

Eva Dude was conferring with nearly 50 businessmen in the north Hungarian town of Miskolc.

It is necessary to establish a joint German-Hungarian chamber of foreign trade, Eva Dude said. The Budapest office of the Association of German Chambers of Industry and Commerce was opened in March 1991 to prepare and finance the realization of such a joint chamber. The office can also serve as an information base for Hungarian and German companies.

SFRY Unity, Territorial Integrity Supported

LD2606210191 Warsaw PAP in English 1856 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Warsaw, June 26—Poland confirmed its invariable support for the unity, territorial integrity and democratic development of Yugoslavia in a statement issued on Wednesday [26 June] by the Polish Foreign Ministry in connection with the recent developments in Yugoslavia.

"Both the use of force in the present crisis and the disintegration of Yugoslavia will have serious and negative international consequences," reads the ministry's statement.

"The choice of the future form of statehood and the political system is an internal affair of the Yugoslav people. Poland expresses hope that a consensus will be reached on this matter on the road of peaceful negotiations of representatives of individual republics, while continuing economic reforms and securing a full observance of human rights in all parts of Yugoslavia, in accordance with the constitutional procedure," the statement goes on.

"Poland still maintains good relations with Yugoslavia. Poland also wants to develop various contacts with individual republics. At the present moment, there are no legal-international grounds to consider those Yugoslav republics which have proclaimed their declarations of independence as independent subjects of international relations," the ministry stated.

Youth Cooperation Agreement Signed With Ukraine

LD2206170491 Warsaw PAP in English 1520 GMT 22 Jun 91

[Text] Warsaw, June 22—Poland and the Ukraine signed here on Saturday [22 June] an agreement on youth cooperation and exchange. On behalf of Poland it was signed by government plenipotentiary for women and family Anna Popowicz and on behalf of the Ukraine by Minister for Youth and Sport Valery Borzov.

This is the first such a bilateral agreement signed by the Ukraine with another country. It provides for establishing a joint commission which will annually examine priorities concerning youth cooperation and exchange.

Under the agreement organizations, schools and institutions of higher learning and other bodies will maintain direct cooperation. The agreement provides also for a free development of Polish youth associations and organizations in the Ukraine and of Ukrainian ones in Poland.

Poland plans to sign similar agreements with Russia and Belorussia, Ms. Popowicz said after the signing ceremony.

Walesa Urged To Veto New Sejm Electoral Bill

AU2606170491 Warsaw PAP in English 2203 GMT 23 Jun 91

[Text] Warsaw, 23 June (PAP)—The National Citizens Committee called on President Lech Walesa on Sunday [23 June] to veto once again the electoral bill passed by the Sejm (lower house) which ignored the Senate's attempt to reach a compromise last week.

The committee said the president should launch his own legislative initiative in this respect based, as the debate here indicated, on the presidential draft electoral law of last February, envisaging a proportional-and-majority parliamentary representation.

Only such an electoral law may give the Third Polish Republic a genuine Sejm, Jan Olszewski told the gathering.

At the motion of Centre Alliance (PC) leader Jaroslaw Kaczynski, the committee called on all political forces and independent figures to take part in a conference scheduled in Warsaw for 30 June, to deal with problems of corruption and the aggravating disintegration of the state.

A broad electoral coalition rallying the PC, the citizens' committees, the Solidarity Trade Union and the Christian National Union (ZCHN) for fighting these phenomena, can be formed on this basis, the committee said.

The committee discussed a draft programme that would serve as a common political basis for the future "independence coalition" in the oncoming election campaign. "The state we want to build...will break off with the forced compromise of the round table (of 1989) and reject the burden of communist law," the draft, authored by the national committee leader Zdzislaw Najder and Jan Olszewski, said.

The draft made no mention however of the main issue of how to overcome economic recession, economist Stefan Kurowski charged.

Referring to the negotiated treaty on Polish-Soviet relations, the committee demanded that the document should not contain any clauses violating Poland's political interests and should be ratified by a newly elected parliament.

This does not mean slowing down the negotiations on Soviet troops withdrawal from Poland, a resolution adopted by the committee says.

Zdzislaw Najder, quoting undisclosed sources, said that the Soviet Union wants Poland not to sign any treaties aimed against the interests of the other side.

"We demand security guarantees from the West and get only promises of a friendly approach instead," Najder noted at this point.

Vetos Election Law

LD2606184291 Warsaw PAP in English 1629 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Warsaw, June 26—President Lech Walesa sent a letter to the Sejm (lower house) on Wednesday [26 June] in which he again vetoed the election law to the Sejm and lodged a motion to review it again.

Presidential Spokesman on Walesa's Situation

AU2606133391 Warsaw ZYCIE WARSZAWY in Polish 24 Jun 91 p 3

[Interview with Presidential Spokesman Andrzej Drzycimski by Piotr Skwiecinski; place and date not given: "Six Months in the Belweder"]

[Text] [Skwiecinski] At the start of his tenure, the president said he would never lead any political group unless the reform process became endangered. His top aides are now saying that the reform process is in danger.

[Drzycimski] The president does not think this danger necessitates the formation of his own presidential party, but he does think there is a need to achieve a certain consensus on Polish affairs for the sake of the reforms. The closer we get to the elections, the more frequently this need is mentioned. On the other hand, the president firmly rejects any political bias. The principle he adopted when he came into office, being the "president of all Poles," is still valid.

To assess the situation it is essential to establish whether or not we are capable of transferring to a noncommunist system without major strife. The president has said several times that we are on the threshold of anarchy.

The president thinks that this entire period is a consolidation of political groups, parties, trade unions, and economic life. He knows he could have imposed other, perhaps better, solutions, but these solutions would have been forced upon on the country against its will. That would have stifled the natural process of evolution. That is why Lech Walesa attaches such importance to natural ways of resolving issues, i.e. debates, and even sharp disputes. But we must talk to each other all the time and exchange opinions.

[Skwiecinski] But the conduct of the president of all the Poles has been viewed lately as a measure of support for just one political group in particular.

[Drzycimski] He is not concerned with party contests. The issue about the election code, which we are highlighting strongly these days, is crucial for the future. If, as a result of the elections, Parliament becomes divided into fragmentary political groups, it will never be able to implement the interests of the country as a whole, because these small groups will have to struggle for their own interests. Sometimes they might implement their own party interests, but more often they will implement the interests of individual deputies.

There is a need for a strong executive authority, a strong government, and the government will be strong if there is a strong Parliament, because then the government will possess a political backbone. A strong Parliament may act as a social pressure valve. A weak Parliament could cause political problems to be settled in the streets. That must be made clear.

[Skwiecinski] Many observers doubt whether it is in the president's interests to have a strong Parliament.

[Drzycimski] Lech Walesa is president, and he really does not fear a strong Parliament. He wants a partner capable of pursuing partnerlike politics. Now we have a ridiculous situation. The government, already in office for six months, has not had a single one of its laws approved.

The election code must permit the formation of strong political parties. Society has grown unaccustomed to parties and is not interested in them. Yet we know that when there are no parties, various informal setups and cliques begin to dominate the scene. That is very unhealthy for the economy.

The point is that Polish political life should develop more or less according to Western patterns. It is not the trade unions that should determine this country's politics.

[Skwiecinski] In the West, the president normally belongs to some party.

[Drzycimski] There are still no genuine parties in Poland, so the president cannot be linked to any of them. Apart from that, he has made it clear on several occasions that he identifies himself with the social teachings of the Church and Christian tradition, so he does possess a clear identity.

[Skwiecinski] Does Christian mean Christian-Democratic?

[Drzycimski] No. His identity is not party-related. It results from his way of thinking. That is a Polish peculiarity.

[Skwiecinski] Over the past two months the president has lost over 20 points on the popularity scale.

[Drzycimski] Yes, because he has been deliberately weakening the government. He is creating conditions for it to function normally. That has been happening ever since the government came into being. It came into being under very difficult conditions. Very strong pressure was applied to make this government a reflection of the political setup that wanted to play the leading role. The aim of the president's election campaign was to win over everyone to his side. We remember the accusations that the Belweder was actually governing and assuming the government's functions.

The president has seen to it that the government represents no particular group. What it does represent, however, is professionalism, preparedness, and expertise, which were needed when the government was formed and are needed now. There was talk of a "third league." Well, this third league has proved capable of shouldering responsibility for the functioning of the state.

The president frequently tackles unpopular issues. He takes the responsibility on himself because he considers it his duty to deal with these issues to indicate necessary paths of change, even if these changes are unpopular.

During the air traffic controllers' strike, the signing of a decision to subject them to military rules was literally seconds away. The decision had already been drafted and was waiting to be signed. If no other solution had been found, the president would definitely have signed it. Lech Walesa does not hide when there is a crisis, and he does not reap profits from it.

[Skwiecinski] He is losing his popularity.

[Drzycimski] If he were merely fighting for his position, he would easily recoup the losses. But he is fighting for the Polish reforms, and they are not always popular.

[Skwiecinski] You have worked in the Belweder under enormous pressure for six months now.

[Drzycimski] In Gdansk the atmosphere was more relaxed. I was responsible for what I said, but I knew that the final political decisions were being made elsewhere. Here it is different. There is no one behind me.

People come to me with various problems. We receive 7,000 letters a day. Some of them ask us to intervene in matters that have absolutely nothing to do with the Presidential Chancellery. People do not believe there are other state authorities apart from us, that this is a normal country, and that it belongs to them.

As president, Lech Walesa is a wonderful boss. When one of his colleagues comes to him with a question, he says: "That is your job. Do it well, and you will earn my praise. Do it badly, and you are fired." That is a straightforward and comprehensible method.

I liken myself to a member of a bomb disposal squad. I defuse various bombs, and I know that one of them might blow me to pieces. That is the way things should be in politics. Anyone who makes a mistake must go.

[Skwiecinski] You could pay for the mistakes of your boss.

[Drzycimski] In a certain sense, yes. I realize that this presidency cannot be compared with any other, neither those in the West, nor future ones in Poland.

[Skwiecinski] How much have relationships between Walesa and his colleagues changed now that the man everyone used to call Lech is president?

[Drzycimski] Most of us have known Lech Walesa for many years. We have always been on first-name terms with him. But when he became president, we decided to change our form of address, because he is no longer a friend, but the president, who was elected by the people to run the state. He can no longer look at me as a friend, because he is the head of state. Even when we go swimming or play ping-pong with him, we never say "Lech" to him any more, it is always "Mr. President." But he still calls us by our Christian names.

[Skwiecinski] Can you tell us anything about your place of employment, the Belweder Palace?

[Drzycimski] When we first came here, we could not believe our eyes and ears. We were told the entire building only has one fax machine and that the guard room has no telephone. We saw cables protruding from walls. It was obvious that the place had never teemed with political life. It felt like a museum.

This building is suitable for holding receptions and hosting delegations, but as the seat of the head of state is quite unsuitable, including for security reasons. It is said that to get rid of the president, it is enough to throw a stone from the Lazienki Palace. Unfortunately, that is true.

The Presidential Office is smaller than any ministry. We have 207 posts, most of which are technical. These 207 posts are distributed among three buildings. The Presidential Chancellery is on Wiejska Street, and the National Security Council shares the premises of the Office of the Council of Ministers. So the office is divided up. That does not encourage efficient functioning.

[Skwiecinski] Does the president still have nowhere to live in Warsaw?

[Drzycimski] He lives in two small rooms in the Belweder. The illustrious Klonowa Mansion has turned out to be privately owned. Although formally it still belongs to the Presidential Office, the president did not want to live in someone else's property that had been requisitioned by the communists.

We would like to build a "presidential compound" behind the British and Swedish Embassies. It would have enough room for duty accommodation for employees of the Belweder and Chancellery, facilities for receiving foreign guests, and a normal apartment for the president.

Government-OPZZ Talks 'Suspended'

LD2706101591 Warsaw PAP in English 2259 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Warsaw, June 25—The talks between the government and the All-Poland Alliance of Trade Unions (OPZZ) were suspended 8 hours after they had begun on Tuesday [25 June] as the unions produced a list of postulates for the government to be considered by June 1. [date as received]

The union negotiators adopted a statement which blames the government for the failure to obtain results in the talks and describes it as a political decision aimed to discredit the OPZZ. The OPZZ claims the government policies lead to economic collapse, while the talks showed that the government does not feel responsible for the future of the country.

Labour Minister Michal Boni declared that the government never evades dialogue in realistic terms and that all the cabinet does is intended to meet the long-term interest of the nation.

OPZZ leader Alfred Miodowicz observed that the minister's standpoint offers some hope for resuming the talks.

Deputy Prime Minister Leszek Balcerowicz admitted during the talks that Poland's financial condition is much worse than expected last autumn when the budget was being planned. His deputy Wojciech Misiag warned that the national income at the year end will be 15-18 percent lower than planned in the budget which requires a similar reduction of expenditures.

Maziarski Interviewed on Center Accord Aims

AU2606174391 Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA in Polish 24 Jun 91 p 3

[Interview with Jacek Maziarski, head of the Center Accord Main Administration, by Malgorzata Subotic; place and date not given: "Poland Still Has a Chance"]

[Text] [Subotic] When the Center Accord was being set up, the people behind it said that that their main goal was to prevent "Solidarity" from being turned into a monolithic party that would seek an exclusive hold on political power: Those grouped around Tadeusz Mazowiecki were fiercely criticized for wanting to take over the citizens committees. Today, the Center Accord is an ardent advocate of a broad election coalition involving the committees and "Solidarity." The committees themselves have become representative bodies for one grouping, namely the Center Accord. What has happened to those declarations of a year ago?

[Maziarski] It is not a broad coalition that we are in favor of, but a strong one. As I understand it, that charge applies to an alliance with that section of the committees and "Solidarity," and of the peasant movement that identifies with our ideals: pluralism, Christian values, a market economy, and a sovereign Poland. This does not mean that an effort is being made to obscure the differences that exist.

In May 1989 the committees had their decisionmaking center— a main administration and funds. Mr. Wujec and his colleagues were in control. It was simply a political central office that intended to transform all the citizens committees into a strong party, and that concealed a fundamental threat to Polish democracy, because there was an enormous disparity between the committees, which were organized and possessed funds and authority, and the nascent parties. The road to a multiparty democracy would have been closed off, and its place would have been taken by a new, leading force.

We did not allow that to happen, and we proposed that the committees should be able to choose the path that they want to take by themselves. Today, the committees differ greatly. Some identify with the Christian Citizens Movement, and some identify with the Center Accord or the Democratic Union. Some do not identify with any group. We do not want complete uniformity, and besides, that kind of uniformity no longer exists today.

We do not want those who are not proceeding in the same direction as we are. The Christian Citizens Movement made us an offer, but we did not accept their proposals. We also do not see any prospect of linking up with the Democratic Union in its present form or with the manifestly social democratic tendency. I want to stress that it is not our intention to take over the citizens committees, but to attract forces who have a political philosophy that is close to that of the Center Accord. This applies to trade unions, peasant groupings, and local government councils. We do not demand political subordination from potential election allies, but agreement on a certain set of values.

[Subotic] Achievements are what attract allies. What has the Center Accord accomplished over the past year?

[Maziarski] We averted the danger of the formation of a present-day Romanian-style model, which would have seen a new leading force emerge under the protective umbrella of "Solidarity" and the committees. I think that was our greatest success, which was attained although we were the targets of a ferocious campaign against us and of charges of lusting after power. We brought about the abandonment of the "roundtable" compromise and the collapse of the policy of wiping the slate clean. One of the results produced by those actions was the election of Lech Walesa as president. In addition, we were the first party to surmount the tendency toward disintegration and the centrifugal movements that are such a misfortune for Polish democracy. We have created a uniform organization with a Christian democratic character. Today, the Center Accord has about 45,000 to 50,000 members.

[Subotic] Your opponents would be more inclined to say that you initiated the divisions. How did the Center Accord abolish that policy of wiping the slate clean?

[Maziarski] Continuity, the absolution of the communist past, "tolerance" toward the remnants of the Polish People's Republic, avoiding conflicts with the enemies democracy, that whole set of terms that was the standard fare offered by Mazowiecki has been thoroughly discredited in the public mind. People know that ideal conditions were created for the pursuit of business by persons in a privileged position, regardless of whether the "reds" were involved or whether it was a new business. The so-called alcohol affair is a straightforward example of

how regulations that lacked clarity and precision made it possible for those in the know to make an easy profit. That is not the only case. There were customs scandals. There have been privatization scandals. It all began with the principle: You give us power, and we will let you get your fill. Today, everyone, young and old, is trying to get his fill. An unwritten agreement was concluded.

People feel that they have been cheated and let down. People who dreamed about the abolition of communism for 45 years are asking themselves: What did we get out of it? They are having to tighten their belts, and only a very few are reaping real, substantial benefits. The Center Accord wants a strong and law-governed state. We do not want Poland to go the way of Bolivia or Ecuador.

[Subotic] Do you know anyone who would oppose a strong, law-governed state, and, what would be even better, a wealthy state, too?

[Maziarski] We are not saying that that is all there is to it. We have a scenario for bringing us to that kind of state. First, we have to hold elections as quickly as possible. As long as we do not have a parliament that reflects the real composition of society in terms of various forces, we will not be able to say how many people want a social democratic state for example, how many want a Christian democratic state, and how many want a state in which the peasant movement has a major role. As long as no strong parliamentary factions emerge, we will not be in a position to form a government that satisfies the wishes of society. In addition, we will not able to pursue policies that enjoy public approval. Every successive government will be weak.

[Subotic] Today everyone claims to support early elections. So what is original about what the Center Accord is proposing?

[Maziarski] At present all the various forces are in favor of holding elections quickly. However, let us not forget that that we have been raising a clamor about this for over a year. There is only one way in which one can marry people's interests to those of the reform once again: democratic elections. No one has been able to devise a better mechanism for mediating between society and government than the system based on Parliament and political parties.

[Subotic] How does what you have just said tie in with the dispute about the electoral code?

[Maziarski] It all starts with the choice of foundations, and the electoral code will determine what those foundations will be like. If we were to elect deputies according to the code currently proposed by the Sejm, we would have a highly fragmented Parliament that would be made up of a plethora of little groups and individual deputies. In six months there would be chaos, and in 12 months we would have a dictatorship. A system that makes it mandatory to place a cross against the name of a candidate forces election campaigns to be waged in a particular way. We would then try to get popular people onto our party list, people who are known from television, for example, Jan Pietrzak, Danuta Rinn. On the other hand, if the system were based on voting for party lists, I would propose specialists—politicians, quite simply. To strike a somewhat different note, I fear that choosing personalities would give free rein to demagogues and would trigger an avalanche of empty promises.

[Subotic] What should happen after the elections?

[Maziarski] Policies must take on a more precise form. No political party will do that, because it is the executive arm of government that makes decisions about concrete details. We, for our part, are proposing the economic program that Adam Glapinski recently discussed at a news conference.

We would like to prevent certain privileged strata from being able to pass on wealth and influence to the next generation. It is a matter of solving the problem using legal means, not of taking revenge on the commies. Whether legislators come out in favor of de-communization or whether they choose some other method, such as establishing how various people have acquired their wealth, is a matter of secondary importance. That is something for the democratically elected Parliament to deal with. We only want to see justice.

[Subotic] At the last election forum staged by the Mazowsze region chapter of "Solidarity," you said that it might no longer be possible to rescue Polish democracy other than by resorting exclusively to hard-line decisions. What did you mean by that?

[Maziarski] We have already wasted a great many opportunities under "Solidarity" governments. The situation in which the country finds itself might end with the collapse of all state and social structures. However, a slight opportunity would arise if the president were to dictate the conditions according to which democracy would function. They would stem from the force of the president's personal authority. However, these proposals are rejected by a majority in the Sejm, and the Center Accord is accused of harboring evil intentions. What I have observed over the past few days does not fill me with optimism. I fear that Poland may become like the Laocoon group of statues—held down and unable to move in any way.

World Bank Loan of $180 Million Approved

AU2606160591 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 0949 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES 26/6/1991—On Tuesday, June 25, 1991, the World Bank approved a loan of 180 million U.S. dollars for Romania. According to Mrs. Ileana Enescu, Romania's representative at the bank and adviser for the board of executive directors—the body approving the loans—20 out of the total 180 million dollars are designed to support the reform, while the balance of 160 million will be used to import basic products such as spare parts for equipment in the power engineering sector, mainly for the thermo-power stations of Turceni and Rovinari, and in the fields of oil, natural gas, lignite mining, transport, telecommunications and mechanization of agriculture. Romania has been a member of the World Bank since 1982. The present loan is the first Romania has got in the last 9 years. The loan was approved unanimously by the Board of Executive Directors.

Journalist Writes Open Letter to Iliescu

AU2706094991 Bucharest ROMANIAI MAGYAR SZO in Hungarian 25 Jun 91 p 2

["Text" of open letter from Hungarian journalist Pal Bodor: "Undesired Exchange of Letters"]

[Text] Mr President! We have personally known each other for more than 20 years. During Ceausescu's time, in my presence, you courageously spoke up against the dictatorship. I regarded you as the man of the future, and I did not hide this, at least with things that could not hurt you and with which I could help Romania's development. It happened that I was perhaps the first one to have an opportunity to inform the world about what happened in Temesvar [Timisoara] on 17 December 1989 through Washington radio, and I was happy to see you appear on Bucharest Television; it seemed that time proved me right. I wrote your first portrait two days later, and I was able to read the text of this portrait in the world press. A few of us happily set out for Romania on the dawn of 5 January 1990, and I will only mention two names from this small group of people, names much more important than mine: Jozsef Antall and Sandor Csoori. I prepared a comprehensive interview with you in Bucharest on 8 January 1990. Commissioned by a prestigious journal from Paris, I wrote and published a lengthy study about you in February 1990, but only Hungarian readers had the opportunity to know its original title: "Is Ion Iliescu a Tragic Hero?"

Why, as early as February 1990, did I believe that you were a tragic hero, more than one and a half months prior to the bloody events in Marosvasarhely [Tirgu Mures]? Because, Mr. Iliescu, I was still unsuspecting. Because I still believed that the discrepancies between your deeds and words and your previous image could only be explained by the fact that you had become a prisoner and hostage of your invisible allies.

Then came Marosvasarhely, and I continued to believe and hope that you were under pressure.

If my sources conveyed your words precisely, your recent statement made it impossible for me to misunderstand it. Do you know, Mr. Iliescu, who it was who—the last time and the first time too—compared the Hungarians in Romania with the American immigrants as far as their rights, language, and schools are concerned, and who said that just as all the citizens of America are Americans, so all the citizens of Romania are Romanians?

You know very well whose comparison you borrowed in your recent statement. It was Ceausescu's.

You both knew very well that it is a little difficult to regard us as immigrants after 800, 900, and 1,000 years. You even knew this a little better than your predecessor. You also knew very well that a really democratic national minority policy starts with the recognition of collective rights. The Romanians in Transylvania fought for this 120 years ago. Now, in 1991, you regard the mother-tongue education of a national minority as separatism.

Mr Iliescu! You are not a tragic hero. You are not a hero at all. You will only allow your country to drift into tragedy. Instead of bridging, solving, and easing the terrible tensions through modern, high-minded, and open-handed care and political activity, you chose the morally and historically most expensive solution, because it is more comfortable for you at the moment: You took the position of the most limited and most prejudicious majority nationalism.

Mr. Iliescu! You wasted the last remnants of my illusions, even if you only made forced compromises to the majority's nationalism by everything that you have allowed, supported, said, and done since you came to power, or even if you did everything from deep conviction. I do not know which is the more serious case.

I am afraid that, with your recent statement, you could, above all, stir up emotions within the Democratic Union of Hungarians in Romania [RMDSZ] before their congress. If, in their desperation, the Hungarians in Romania broke with decades of patience and efforts of rapprochement—an attitude that has yielded so little results—and took up a different political style and struggle and behaved as their opponents behave, this would best serve the hidden powers of Securitate, the Vatra Romaneasca, and all the extremist majority nationalists. I do not know how long our soberness, self-control, and calm can still prevail.

Fortunately for history, there are still sober Romanians who do not hate and who cannot be incited against the minorities by alarming rumors, slander, or incitement. This is why, despite all this, despite your current political attitude, and despite our almost hopeless bitterness, quite a few of us can still be non-haters!

Signed: Pal Bodor

President Iliescu's Response to Open Letter

AU2706104691 Bucharest ADEVARUL in Romanian 20 Jun 91 pp 1, 5

[Open Letter from President Ion Iliescu to NEPSZABADSAG journalist Pal Bodor: "An Undesired Epistolary Dialogue"]

[Text] Mr. Pal Bodor: I hesitated a long time over whether it was worth responding to the so-called "open letter" you addressed to me in NEPSZABADSAG. I decided finally to respond to the insinuations of the article in question.

The first thing worth mentioning is the procedure you used—a procedure often employed by those who plead for dubious causes and whose only goal is to discredit the interlocutor or adversary (which, I suppose, is not the case). In your article, you proceed from an alleged statement of mine (true, insecure about the problem you are tackling, you ask yourself whether the information you have received is accurate; notwithstanding this, you do not hesitate to venture a harsh attack, despite the feelings of sympathy and confidence you harbored toward me in the past). What is at stake here is a presumed comparison of the Hungarians in Romania and the immigrants in the United States. You will certainly not be able to ever find such a thing in any of my statements or assessments! I suspect that the source cannot be other than my discussion with representatives of certain creeds of the Hungarian population in Romania. On that occasion, one of the participants referred to certain (distorted) assessments made by the members of an American lawyers delegation, who had conducted talks with Romanian parliamentarians and members of the constitutional commission. The American delegates made essentially positive assessments about the contents and general spirit of the Constitution Theses now being discussed by Romania's Parliament. In any case, in connection with the situation of minorities, in my response I stressed that uninformed opinions are not edifying and that one cannot compare situations that are not comparable; it is known, for instance, that such a large minority in the United States as the Hispanic one claims neither education in the Spanish language nor the use of the Spanish language in the administration or justice. In the United States—a multinational conglomerate of states—all citizens accept one language to communicate: English. Thus, this situation cannot compare with the situation in our country. As you may see, my views are completely different from the ones you accredit to me!

Mr. Pal Bodor, I suspect you have received a completely distorted report about this dialogue. It is sad to note the haste with which you launched this "open letter" by starting out from false assumptions and the fact that you did not hesitate to make an insulting assessment, including a comparison with Ceausescu, and to launch an appeal against certain alleged hostile attitudes of mine toward the Hungarian population in Romania. This is all the more sad because, in the article in question, you recall our meetings and talks in the past, that were an opportunity to become acquainted with my way of thinking and with my feelings; this might have made you show greater reticence in making hasty judgments or even caustic remarks.

I am also compelled to note that you are deliberately misinterpreting and distorting other viewpoints of mine as well: The statement, for instance, that I view education in the mother tongue of ethnic minorities as a sign of separatism is completely false and devoid of any grounds! The same applies to the affirmation that I would promote "the position of the most narrow-minded nationalism." However, I have to note that the very accusations launched by you—not accidentally—the day before the congress of the Magyar Democratic Union of Romania [UDMR] are passionately nationalistic and, undoubtedly, instigating.

However, I feel obliged to draw your attention to the fact that the people of Tirgu Mures seem to have better understood the need to ease interethnic tensions than you did. As you may know, I visited the city of Tirgu Mures shortly before the UDMR Congress. I had talks with the representatives of the political forces, trade union leaders, the Romanian and Hungarian intellectuals of the city, and people in the street, to plead for understanding and civic—including interethnic—reconciliation, something that is at variance with your insinuations that I could have "fomented passions within the UDMR."

Mr. Pal, people—Romanians and Hungarians alike—desire peace and quiet; this was also demonstrated during the UDMR Congress proceedings, which proceeded peacefully—as you may have learned by now. And another thing that has to be noted is that fact that the congress distanced itself from certain extremist positions.

For all these reasons and others, for the discussion of which this letter is not the right framework, it seems to me at least an exaggeration to speak about "the desperation and lack of hope of Hungarians in Romania." We do understand the feelings of frustration of a considerable number of our fellow citizens—both Romanian, Hungarian, and other nationalities—who are confronted with the great difficulties posed by this stage of radical change: the much needed but also burdensome economic reform and the transition to a fully democratic society.

...Perhaps I should have treated the unfairness and even wickedness in your article with what it merits—silence. However, I have always believed that dialogue is the only way to build bridges between people—and I will remain faithful to this idea.

Further on Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact Statement

AU2606124991 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1203 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES 26/6/1991—A declaration adopted on Monday by a joint session of the Romanian Parliament on the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact continues to draw comments in the central press.

The independent daily "ADEVARUL": The highest body in the country proved out to be the highest after all, sanctioning our view of an historic injustice. But it will really become so only when the most important act of the country, the constitution, is duly amended in order that a long-repressed complaint may find its place in it for ever."

The National Salvation Front's daily "AZI": Under the dome of Romania's Parliament we lived at last a day that was long overdue in our history (...): Romanian parliamentarians in large numbers stated their opinion with undissimulated joy, hopeful and expectant that Bessarabia will be restored to its original borders in a more or less near future (...)

"COTIDIANUL" (founder Ion Ratiu): Its denunciation did not bring the cancellation of the Iliescu-Gorbachev deal, as it normally should have. We are only at the beginning of the road.

Romanian MAGYAR SZO (Hungarian-language central democratic daily: Parliament proclaimed: Bessarabia, Bukovina—age-old Romanian land (..). No vote was cast against. It was "the voice of gods."

The trade unionist daily "REALITATEA": It was the Moldovans across the Prut who "forced our hand." Better later than never (...) the 16 parliamentarians who took the floor in the same place where Nicolae Titulescu, Ion Bratianu, Grigore Gafencu and other Romanians stood up in defence of our ancient land spoke full truths—we were not the aggressors in 1941, the Soviet Union was in 1940: We crossed the river Prut to recover the territories lost under the award. The declaration opens the road to further diplomatic, economic and cultural actions with the Romanians along the Prut (we do not believe in the "small steps policy" which the government plans) to help them better understand themselves as a part that was never cut off from Romanian spirit.

Roman Said To Want Power 'At All Costs'

AU2406193591 Bucharest DREPTATEA in Romanian 21 Jun 91 p 1

[Serban Sandulescu article: "How Long Will This Merry-Go-Round of Lies Continue?"]

[Text] In December 1989, Petre Roman stated in front of the whole nation that he was eagerly waiting to relinquish his position as prime minister to resume his activities as a teacher.

Now, a year and a half after he took hold of the reins of government, thus pushing the country to an abyss, it is crystal clear that Petre Roman lied. He does not care what is happening; he is interested in preserving power as long as possible and at all costs.

He lied before the election campaign when, through the fierce economic policy he promoted, he gave a false impression of well-being.

He lied when he said that he would organize free elections. All of us know what the 20 May 1990 elections were like.

He lied during the election campaign when, through statements lacking any grounds, he promised false social protection. Now there is proof that he will not be able to guarantee it.

He lied after the elections when, by abandoning the program on which he based his election campaign, he presented a false privatization program to the nation in the hope that, thus, he would mislead free people, obtain foreign credits, and attract foreign investors. He achieved almost nothing. The only thing he succeeded in was to involve the country in debts.

He lied when he proceeded with the so-called first price liberalization, which was actually a large and guided increase in prices that had nothing in common with the free market economy, through which he tried to make up for the serious errors of the economic policy he was promoting.

He lied when he carried out the second price liberalization that also has nothing in common with the market economy he wants to "implement."

He lied when he carried out the so-called government reshuffling; this was, in fact, an aborted attempt to change the image of an unpopular government unable to bring the sudden change awaited by many.

He lied again a few days ago when he said that his government will organize truly free elections. Can anyone believe him any more?

He is lying each time he promises that he will solve the serious economic problems raised by one trade union or another or the problems of one enterprise, social group or another. Each of his promises to solve problems and each solution he adopts does nothing but worsen our situation.

To save his position as prime minister, he makes new promises, but he is preparing a third and more serious price "liberalization" than the preceding onesm whereby he will take with two hands what he is now promising or giving away with one hand.

No one in the West trusts him any more except, maybe, Francois Mitterrand. But he, too, is only able to provide words and promises and, in practice, nothing else.

Each additional day Petre Roman's government survives does nothing but put the future of our country more and more seriously in jeopardy; it makes the efforts that have to be made to correct the disaster this government will leave behind more difficult and burdensome. We hope that the day when it will no longer exist is very near. However, only we can turn this hope into reality ourselves: through our unity, determination, and firmness.

Banker on Aid, Possible Return to Centralism

AU2606174991 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1542 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 26/6/1991—Mugur Isarescu, the governor of Romania's National Bank told a "ROMPRES" reporter, after his visit to Washington, that in the United States he had had talks with Allan Greenspan, the governor of the Federal Reserve System, with the first deputy secretary of the Department of the Treasury John Robson, contacts with high officials at the Department of State, and talks at the Capitol with Senator Warner and Mrs. Oaker, member of the House of Representatives.

Governor Mugur Isarescu also said he had given interviews to the publications "WALL STREET JOURNAL" and "U.S.A. TODAY" and to a radio station and a cable television one. He characterised the last one as "difficult" as most of the questions he was asked did not make the object of activity of a national bank governor.

"At the headquarters of the International Monetary Fund," he said, I also met its president and director-general Camdessus and had talks with Deputy Director Kahn, who is "in charge of us," and at the World Bank, I discussed with the vice president and director for Eastern and southern Europe. Many things to do, as you can see."

Speaking about the purpose of his visit, Mugur Isarescu said that, although it was unofficial, it had two things in view: first, the presentation of the evolution of the economic reform in Romania, stress being laid on four elements, namely the stage of the process of privatisation, the price policy, the liberalisation of prices in the economy and the convertibility of the national currency; second, an appeal to financial support, as agreed during negotiations with IMF, at the beginning of this year.

"My message was clear. If we are not granted the support we have been promised, in keeping with the program agreed, for lack of other instruments of economic management we shall be forced to appeal to centralism and it would be a pity, that's exactly what I said," concluded the National Bank's governor Mugur Isarescu.

Iliescu Receives UNCTAD Secretary General

AU2606170391 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1346 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 26/6/1991—Romania's President Ion Iliescu received Wednesday, 26 June, at Cotroceni Palace, the UNCTAD [United Nations Conference on Trade and Development] Secretary-General Kenneth K.S. Dadzie. Issues were tackled concerning the process of political and economic changes started in Romania after the December 1989 revolution, which the guest considered to be irreversible. Mr. Kenneth K.S. Dadzie assured President Iliescu UNCTAD was willing to assist Romania. The possibility for Romania to join the system of commercial-financial agreements in effect in international life was discussed and the furthering of the forms of technical assistance promoted by the UN Conference for Trade and Development. The guest said he had been positively surprised with the realities in Romania, as against the current opinion about this country abroad, at the level of UN bodies included.

At the close of the interview, Kenneth K.S. Dadzie said that President Ion Iliescu had detailed for him certain elements related to the rhythm of the process of economic reform going on in Romania as well as a number of delicate aspects related to the risks the reform could trigger.

Federal

Jovic: Nation on 'The Brink of Catastrophe'

LD2606183691 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1738 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Belgrade, June 26 (TANJUG)—Borisav Jovic, member of the Yugoslav State Presidency from Serbia and leader of the ruling Socialist party of Serbia in the republic, today urged that measures of the legal state be used to prevent the anti-constitutional acts and avert the dangers of an all-round disaster in Yugoslavia.

In a statement to journalists following the developments in the Yugoslav republics of Slovenia and Croatia, Jovic said that unilateral [words indistinct] were passed in these republics.

"These acts led to the violent and gross break up of the Yugoslav state community, pushing the peoples and citizens of Yugoslavia to the brink of a catastrophe," Jovic assessed.

Jovic was Yugoslav state presidency president up to May 15th of this year. Under an established rotational system, he should have been replaced by Croatia's presidency representative Stepan Mesic.

Mesic did not receive the necessary number of votes (five) from the members of the top collective leadership of Yugoslavia and this had blocked the work of the body.

Presidency Session Begins; Absentees Noted

LD2706104191 Zagreb Radio Croatia Network in Serbo-Croatian 1000 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] A session of the Presidency of Yugoslavia began at 0900 this morning in Belgrade's Federation Palace. HINA [Croation News Agency] has learned that in addition to the representatives of Croatia and Slovenia, Stipe Mesic and Janez Drnovsek, the representative of Macedonia, Vasil Tupurkovski, has also not responded to the invitation to attend.

The session is being attended only by the presidency members from Serbia and its provinces, Bosnia-Hercegovina and Montenegro. Also taking part are Yugoslav Assembly President Slobodan Gligorijevic, and Federal Secretary for Internal Affairs Petar Gracanin. Neither Federal Executive Council President Ante Markovic FEC, nor Federal Secretary for National Defense Veljko Kadijevic, nor Federal Secretary for Foreign Affairs Budimir Loncar are present. It is worth noting that the members were invited to the 121st session of the presidency although the 120th session has not yet been completed (at which [Stipe] Mesic failed to be elected president).

Today's session has only one item on the agenda: An analysis of the current political situation in Yugoslavia.

FEC Session Discusses Current Situation

LD2606175191 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1611 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Belgrade, 26 Jun (TANJUG)—During its session today, the Federal Executive Council (FEC), presided over by Ante Markovic, discussed the current political situation in the country and heard the reports by appropriate government departments on the implementation of its decisions, taken in connection with the measures taken by the Assembly of the Republic of Slovenia, especially those tied up with the SFRY's external borders, the functioning of the customs service as a single Yugoslav service and air traffic control.

As reported by the FEC Secretariat for Information, the FEC noted that in individual places in Slovenia certain functions of the federation have been taken over by force, such as the seizure of custom offices and ordering custom officials to join the Slovene customs service.

The FEC discussed in particular the functioning of the monetary and foreign currency system as well as control measures taken against the illegal functioning of all monetary, finance, and foreign currency dealings in the country. In this connection the FEC was briefed on the actions taken by the Yugoslav National Bank to ensure a normal functioning of these dealings. [passage omitted]

The situation in crisis areas in certain parts of the Republic of Croatia, where armed conflicts occured and human lives were lost, was discussed in particular.

The FEC assessed positively the role of the Yugoslav People's Army units, as well as measures undertaken to prevent interethnic conflicts.

The FEC notes that it warned the subjects of these events that it was possible that interethnic conflicts could erupt, especially in the case of [words indistinct].

The FEC expressed deep regret over the loss of life.

The FEC listened to a report by the Federal Secretariat for Foreign Affairs on the Secretariat's activity of informing the (?heads) of diplomatic missions about the FEC stands, and about first positive reactions regarding (?decisions) by the federal government adopted on 25 June. [passage indistinct]

FEC in Contact With Slovene, Croatian Leaders

AU2706095091 Belgrade Radio Belgrade Network in Serbo-Croatian 0900 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Olivija Rusovac report]

[Excerpt] Olivija Rusovac has a report from the SFRY Assembly:

[Rusovac] I am actually reporting from the Federal Executive Council building and not the assembly. I was told here that the Federal Executive Council is continually in touch with the leadership of Slovenia and Croatia

and that it will continuously monitor the implementation of its conclusions and orders.

According to the Federal Government, Croatian Premier Manolic informed Markovic that the decisions on Croatia's independence, as he himself said, have been put to (?a test), and that, in contrast with Slovenia, these decisions are not being implemented. Therefore, the measures taken against Slovenia are different from those taken against Croatia.

Markovic [words indistinct] federal customs as a peaceful act. Markovic replied that the (?Slovenes) started violence first and that the customs (?offices) will be regained.

The information [words indistinct] the Slovene police has arrested the heads of Ljubljana and Portoroz airports and this is why these airports are blocked. Maribor airport is operational.

It is (?uncertain) whether Peterle will visit Belgrade, even though his visit has been announced.

The Federal Government also adopted another important decision concerning the federal budget. [passage omitted]

Court Bans Croatian, Slovene Forces Laws

LD2606172991 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1600 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Belgrade, June 26 (TANJUG)—The constitutional court of Yugoslavia today suspended the application of those provisions in the Yugoslav republic of Croatia's law on internal affairs which provide for the possibilities of activating the republican armed forces.

The ruling Croatian Democratic Union (HDZ) on May 28 founded its republican armed forces, "the national guard corps," the formations of which, as Croatian Defence Minister Martin Spegelj put it, would be employed "also for the establishment of legal order" in this Yugoslav republic.

Last night, Croatia's parliament passed the declaration of independence virtually seceding itself from Yugoslavia.

The procedure to determine the constitutional character of some provisions in the Croatian republican law had been raised by the Yugoslav Defence Ministry when it decided that these provisions have helped to "create a paramilitary formation in Croatia, outside the Yugoslav Armed Forces."

The Defence Ministry held that this "professional, armed formation of military structure has been entrusted with such assignments as belong only to the Armed Forces of the SFRY according to the Yugoslav Constitution."

The suspension of certain provisions in the Croatian law would be valid until the Yugoslav constitutional court takes the final decision about the constitutionality of this law.

As proposed by Yugoslav Defence Minister Army General Veljko Kadijevic, the constitutional court today banned also the application of certain provisions in the law on the defence and protection of constitutional order of the Yugoslav republic of Slovenia.

It suspended the provisions in the Slovenian law regarding the taking over of the federation's powers in the regulating of conscription, in the country's defences, and in organizing and commanding the army.

Parties Assess Croatian, Slovene Moves

LD2606174491 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1514 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Belgrade, June 26 (TANJUG)—Political parties in Yugoslavia today assesss differently Croatia's and Slovenia's declaration of independence. Their reactions vary from the less frequent support for the two republics' moves to the calls to avert the fragmentation of Yugoslavia.

Muhamed Filipovic, vice president of the Moslem Bosnjak Organization, a party in the Yugoslav republic of Bosnia-Hercegovina, voiced fear that his republic would fall into a particularly difficult position after Croatia's and Slovenia's declaration of independence.

"Serbo-Croatian conflict may become political so it may well happen that the two conflicting sides would try to square their accounts to the detriment of Bosnia-Hercegovina," said Filipovic.

The Serbian Renewal Movement (SPO), the biggest opposition party in the Yugoslav republic of Serbia, maintains that what is now essential is to protect the Serbs in Croatia.

SPO Vice President Jovan Marjanovic told TANJUG that the Federal top of Yugoslavia and the official Serbian leadership have so far had little understanding for this need.

"At this time, one can no longer count on the state Presidency and the Federal Assembly so that the SPO holds that the Serbian state, with its armed force and territorial defence, must let itself be heard," said Marjanovic.

Dragoljub Micunovic, president of the Democratic Party, second strongest opposition party in Serbia's parliament, assessed the moves by Slovenia and Croatia as "hazardous gestures."

He said that "no account is being taken either of law, or of historical responsibility, or the constitution, and also of the inability to impose one's own political will onto others."

The League of Communists-Movement for Yugoslavia warned that the dissociation was "a direct attack on borders, human rights and freedoms" and those who wanted to dissemble Yugoslavia had to be halted.

The nationalist VMRO-DPMNE [Democratic Party for Macedonian National Unity], biggest party in the parliament of the Yugoslav republic of Macedonia, has felicitated the peoples of the republics of Slovenia and Croatia on "the act of declaring sovereignty and independence," which was a "basic and inalienable right of every nation."

Chief delegate of the republic of Macedonia in the Federal parliament's chamber of the republics and provinces Petar Gosev maintained that Slovenia's and Croatia's decision "probably meant an act of the final decomposition of hitherto Yugoslavia."

The nationalist Croatian Party of Law declared it would not accept the decision made by the assembly of the Yugoslav republic of Croatia on its future entering into an alliance of sovereign republics.

In its statement, this party said that the declaration on establishing Croatia as an independent and sovereign state passed by the assembly of this Yugoslav republic last night, nonetheless has not made Croatia such a state because this is an act on the dissociation and at the same time an act on the association within an alliance of sovereign republics of Yugoslavia.

Defense Secretariat Issues Statement

LD2706101291 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 0818 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] [Dateline indistinct] The Federal Secretariat for National Defense [SSNO] has concluded that the illegal and unconstitutional decisions of the Assembly of the Republic of Slovenia and the Assembly of the Republic of Croatia providing for unilateral declarations of the independence of these two republics are directly threatening the territorial integrity of Yugoslavia and in a violent way suspend its legal system. In view of this, the armed forces consider these decisions as null and void, the SSNO stresses in a statement.

The above decisions by the Assembly of the Republic of Slovenia and the Assembly of the Republic of Croatia, the statement stresses, have considerably exacerbated the situation in the country. Interethnic confrontations have been heightened, and peace, security, and the safety of citizens and their property have been threatened especially in areas with mixed populations. In several localities in the Republic of Croatia fresh armed conflicts have flared up again with a number of people killed and injured.

The danger of the existing and potential crisis points in the country being tranformed into large-scale conflicts is growing. The activities of the JNA units so far have helped to avoid incidents of even more tragic consequences. The SSNO has for some time now pointed to the inevitability of such developments unless an end was put to the policy of fait accompli and lawlessness, the statement stresses.

In line with the armed forces constitutionally outlined responsibility to defend the country's territorial integrity, the conclusions of the SFRY Assembly's Federal Chamber, and the decisions of the Federal Executive council, the SSNO has already taken necessary measures to safeguard the inviolability of the SFRY borders and to counter any attempt to change them forcibly or threaten them from whatever quarter. The JNA units will carry out their duties in a determined way [words indistinct] and possible resistance. In the course of this it will [words indistinct] and will avoid the use of force but will counter any act [words indistinct] combat, the statement stresses.

The Federal Secretariat for National Defense reiterates its advocacy of a peaceful, democratic, and legal solution to the Yugoslav crisis and wishes to emphasise the JNA's determination to prevent any violent threats against the country's territorial integrity and any escalation in interethnic armed conflicts.

Army Commander Promises To Crush Resistance

AU2706071691 Belgrade Radio Belgrade Network in Serbo-Croatian 0700 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] Lieutenant General Konrad Kolsek, commander of the Fifth Military District, has sent a message to Lojze Peterle, president of the Executive Council of the Slovene Assembly. The message says:

I inform you that the Fifth Military District has the task of taking over all border crossings and protecting the state borders of the SFRY. We are counting on the cooperation of all organs and citizens of Slovenia. The task will be carried out unconditionally.

We will also act according to the rules of the combat use of units. Any resistance will be crushed and the consequences will be borne by those who issue and carry out orders, the message states.

Daily: Secession 'Chief Motivating Force'

LD2606130791 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1155 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Skopje, June 26 (TANJUG)—'Secession is the chief motivating force and perspective' for the Republics of Slovenia and Croatia, the Skopje daily NOVA MAKEDONIJA writes today.

The paper, published in the capital of the Republic of Macedonia, believes that 'Yugoslavia must undergo a change, but not in the way advocated by Croatia and Slovenia'. 'It remains to be seen if the newly independent states will enter into an alliance with the other Yugoslav states or with somebody else', it adds.

'Slovenia is trying to do the impossible ... To get out of the Yugoslav community while retaining all of the benefits in the economic sphere', writes NOVA MAKEDONIJA.

Unlike Slovenes 'who want to profit by fishing in troubled waters, with Croats, everything remains in a sphere of incomprehensible insistence on a national state, where the rational has been lost completely', it says.

'If the West goes ahead and does what it has announced (isolation, suspension of aid) and if events in Yugoslavia take a dramatic turn, it will be clear then who is to blame for instigating and carrying out secessionism and breaking up the country', the paper warns.

Croatia and Slovenia on Tuesday proclaimed their sovereignty and independence, which has automatically put the Yugoslav Constitution out of action in the two republics.

Slovenia

Immediate Economic Impact of Dissociation Cited

LD2606183791 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1732 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Belgrade, June 26 (TANJUG)—The daily POLITIKA EKSPRES writes today that the disassociation of the Yugoslav Republics of Slovenia and Croatia 'is not only a political, but also a concrete economic act, which has already resulted in great damages to the Yugoslav economy.'

'Economics are at the core of disassociation, or rather, the economic privileges enjoyed by the northwestern Yugoslav republics, and which they were never willimg to forfeit writes POLITIKA EKSPRES which is printed in Belgrade.

POLITIKA EKSPRES carries a recent statement made by the President of the Yugoslav Republic of Montenegro Momir Bulatovic, who says that in the current phase, Slovenia will [word indistinct] larger money issues in order to increase its accounts with fictitious money.

'The devalued dinar will then be used for buying foreign currency and effective currency until a sum is achieved which will secure the basis for the 'lipa' said Bulatovic.

POLITIKA EKSPRES also claims that Slovenia has for a (?long time) appeared in an organized fashion on the hard currency black market in Yugoslavia, and that foreign currency is being syphoned [word indistinct] foreign banks until the time when it will be activated as the basis of the new Slovenian currency.

Kucan Addresses Slovene Assembly

AU2506230091 Ljubljana Radio Slovenia Network in Slovene 1600 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Speech by Slovene President Milan Kucan to the Slovene Assembly—live]

[Text] Honored Mr. President, honored deputies! Today, you are facing a historic decision to make the Republic of Slovenia an autonomous and independent state. The proposed Constitutional Act and the constitutional law for its implementation enable the state of Slovenia to take over all rights and obligations that had been—according to our will—previously transferred to the organs of the SFRY through the Federal Constitution. By adopting these documents the Slovene Assembly is fulfilling its duty imposed by the plebiscite. According to the plebiscitary decision, the Assembly must ensure the institutional and legal conditions that will enable the Republic of Slovenia to establish effective power on its territory within six months from the day the decision was announced.

On this day, Slovenia, being an independent state, also opens the procedure toward its international recognition. The Assembly decisions made today will enable Slovenia to turn to governments of other countries asking them to recognize it as an independent and sovereign state and to establish diplomatic relations with it. At the same time, Slovenia will ask to be admitted into the UN Organization, the European Council, and other international organizations. By deciding to form its own state today, the Slovene nation created an equal and productive cooperation with nations that until now had lived together in a common state, with its neighbors, and with all other nations of Europe and of the world, and takes its share of responsibility for their peace and security.

Here, where Central Europe and the Balkans meet and where Slovenes live, peace, stability, prosperity, preservation of the natural balance [naravno ravnotezje], international cooperation, and other values that modern humanity is striving for, are necessary conditions for peace and security for all European nations and states. Peace and security are only possible if human rights and freedom of individuals and nations are also granted to each nation and each country in this part of the world, as an expression and confirmation of this freedom. Last November in Paris the leaders of Europe and North America announced that we live in the time of democracy, peace, and unity in Europe. This also applies to the Slovene nation, realizing its freedom, human rights, and self-determination with its independence. That is how Slovenes understood this stand of European political will. Only if Slovenes are free as individuals and as a nation can we give our creative contribution, and take over our share of responsibility for democracy and peace in this part of the world, and by this the responsibility for the emerging European unity as well. By imposing a setup based on some different, past times, symbolized by

the fall of the Berlin wall [as heard], and by imposing relations with other nations that would not reflect their free will, interests, and sovereignty, we cannot permanently safeguard democracy, peace, and creation of a common European home. An imposed setup and imposed relations between nations can only lead to instability, a threat to and violation of human rights, and limitation of national identity and equality. Therefore, they lead to nationalistic conflicts and hegemonistic limitations, instead of harmony. Such relations are becoming a constant threat to peace and democracy and most seriously hinder processes of European integration.

Honored deputies! Slovenia is entering the international community with pride and historic reasoning as a democratic state. Its development is based upon the principles and measures of that European democracy that has grown from the very essence and foundations of the victorious anti-fascist struggle of the democratic nations of the world. The Slovene nation, with its rebellion and struggle against fascism, with its army, authority, state, and territory, was one of those nations. Therefore, Slovenia places human rights, based on the principle that all people are born free, with equal dignity, and with equal rights as one of the foundations of its statehood.

According to the general declaration on human rights, human rights form the basis for freedom, justice, and peace in the world. The Republic of Slovenia wants and will implement its decision that human rights and basic freedoms of all people regardless of their nationality, religion, race, and other differences among them will be consistently respected. Slovenia will ensure and promote the citizens' political, economic, social, cultural, and other rights and freedoms. For the members of the Italian and Hungarian minority the Republic of Slovenia will ensure all those rights protecting the preservation and development of their equality and national identity in the spirit of the most contemporary legal organizations and practice in the world. The Republic of Slovenia will help those Slovene citizens who are not Slovenes to preserve their cultural traditions and particularities, and will ensure their equal participation in all spheres of social, economic, and political life. Foreign citizens on the Slovene territory will be guaranteed the same position as is guaranteed to foreign citizens by the legislation and practice of the European states.

The implementation, respect, and assurance of human rights and basic freedoms in the Republic of Slovenia depend only on us and our will. We do not have the same influence on the international level or stands of the international community, nor on the stands of the other republics toward us, but our internal democracy, with a high degree of respect for human rights depends solely on us. The degree to which human rights are truly respected is a basic measure used to tell whether a society or a state is democratic or not. There is no reason that any European state should have a higher degree of respect for, and protection of, human rights than we do, not only formally, but also how far the rights are implemented in everyday life. From this point of view we cannot be satisfied with the conditions as they are in Slovenia at the moment. It would be good if we would define, respect, and implement this principle in our new constitution and in this light tackle the dilemmas that currently seem to be the main obstacle for our constitution to be adopted. It would be wise to remember that democracy is much more than anti-communism, also much more than just a change of a monopoly over the truth.

The constitution of a sovereign state of Slovenia undoubtedly represents the main factor in the legal protection of human rights, as well as the main factor in the basis of a law-governed state, making this protection possible. In the opinion of the republican Presidency—which last June proposed to the Assembly an adoption of the Slovene constitution—it is, necessary to overcome political dilemmas by political parties acting responsibly, and to adopt such a constitution that will express general national consensus as soon as possible. Finally, we are obliged to do this by the decisions that were already passed by this legislature and particularly by the obligations imposed by the plebiscitary decision of the Slovene nation and other Slovene citizens.

The respect for law and independence of judges and courts is a necessary prerequisite for protecting human rights, human freedom, and human peace. It is our duty to do everything we can to present ourselves in the democratic community as a democratic society rather than an ideologically split and revanchist society that incessantly looks back at its past, its old and perpetually reestablished divisions, that are exhausting our strength so that we cannot face reality and the future. I can say that those who reestablish and deepen those divisions among people at this moment do not work in the interest of the nation.

Now that Slovenes and their state are starting on their way toward participation in the international community of the sovereign states, the Republic of Slovenia expresses its full and consistent adherence to the principles and regulations stated in the UN Charter, in the Helsinki Final Act, in international documents on human rights, and in all those international documents that regulate international relations and cooperation between nations and states in the European and world community.

The Republic of Slovenia recognizes, respects, and supports the sovereignty, equality, independence, and self-identity of every other state and all rights of any state that stem from international agreements and other provisions of international law. The Republic of Slovenia will recognize all obligations set by international law as a sovereign state and will recognize all those rights that it asks for itself to all other states including states which will, just as it will, be formed on the territory of the SFRY.

In conformity with the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act, the Republic of Slovenia recognizes all borders of all states in Europe and the world as inviolable, something

that certainly applies to its own borders as well. Therefore, it justifiably expects its own borders with any of its neighbors not to be called into question, because, although they are now regulated by agreements formally signed by the SFRY, this was done with our will and consent.

Slovenia respects the territorial integrity of all states and opposes any activity that would be at variance with international law. It opposes the use of force or threat with force against any other state or when solving any international conflict. It will use its own armed forces—as long as it has them, bearing in mind that it may become a demilitarized territory in the future—exclusively for its own defense and within the powers granted by the UN Charter or the Helsinki Final Act. With its own example and initiatives, it would strive for disarmament and demilitarization of the part of Europe to which it belongs. The Helsinki Final Act also obliges us in the process of legalizing our independence. Although we shall proclaim ourselves an autonomous and sovereign state at today's session, we want to take over the functions that involve a gradual achievement of effective powers. I mean that the Helsinki Act in fact obliges us to use this gradual method, so that our activity will not prevent the free flow of people, goods, capital, achievements, information, ideas, and other values, and so that our one-sided and insufficiently thought-out decisions will not threaten everything that the integration processes of European states and their institutions—which we want to join as soon as possible—are based upon and are striving toward.

A gradual transfer of this function is necessary lest we interrupt economic and other vital currents and therefore endanger interests of others in Yugoslavia and beyond. It is also in our interest to behave as a state that is joining the international community in order not to stop the free flow over the new international borders of the Republic of Slovenia, since what we are doing is happening in a Europe that sees its future in abolishing borders as physical barriers between people, nations, and states. After our state sovereignty is fully respected and implemented, we still must implement the policy of open borders. We have said many times already that it is not our aim to form a closed national state. Our state is our means and aim for establishing institutionalized and uninstitutionalized links with other peoples and states on an equal footing.

The taking over of state borders by the organs of the independent Slovene state must not mean and does not mean closing down or hindering the flow of people and goods, but only an activity that belongs to every independent state. We want the borders with present neighboring states to remain even more open than they are today, and as concerns the border with neighboring Croatia, it should be completely open according to a corresponding agreement and in mutual interest. There must be no wires and walls along our borders, and even less ditches, and barriers must be lifted as a welcome greeting to a friend and neighbor. Only with such a goal, is it possible to understand the present regulation of border crossings with Croatia. An appropriate protective policy of our economy linked with the regulation of our relations with the EC, the European Free Trade Association, and other international organizations must also serve this kind of tension.

We wish to be a European state not only in the geographical sense. Therefore, we must enter Europe in a European manner. This manner assumes democracy, respect for the rights and interests of others, their security, and peace. Let us tell this to ourselves now so that there will be no need for other people to come tell us this, particularly not the Federal Government, which should finally start negotiating the gradual takeover of our rights that we had voluntarily transferred to the federal organs. We expect and propose that the Federal Government negotiate the manner and time of the takeover of these functions of ours, and not whether these functions are ours and whether we have the right to resume them. We do not demand anything that is not ours and that we would not grant to others. However, we cannot and we do not wish to agree on conditions that would be dictated by others only, while our interests and actions are characterized as unilateral, aggressive, and secessionist actions, as they have been up to now. It is easier to fight like this, and it would be easier to convince the world that they are witnessing undemocratic actions and decisions. A proposal of conclusions in the Federal Chamber of the SFRY Assembly on the Slovene proposal for consentaneous solutions in the process of separation does not promise much and is difficult to perceive as anything but a dictate. Therefore, we must point out on this occasion, that as a state we wish to fulfill all our obligations that we have toward those with which we have lived together so far, especially because we also have obligations toward foreign countries and international organizations. That is why we want to respect all international agreements, bilateral and multilateral, that Yugoslavia signed with foreign partners in our interest and with our consent as well. All questions regarding the legal succession and other questions of separation should be resolved in the manner proposed—gradually and consentaneously in accordance with the prevailing principles and regulations of international law.

The Republic of Slovenia will do everything possible to ensure that the legitimate rights of the new states that will emerge on the present territory of Yugoslavia are not affected in the process of dissociation, as well as their future comprehensive cooperation, and the interests of other countries and of the international community. We wish to resolve all open questions and possible disputes in a peaceful way in order not to endanger international peace, security, and justice—in good faith, conscientiously and honestly, based on international law. However, to accomplish such intentions we need a partner of the same good faith and with the same intentions. Instead of this we have mostly encountered the mendacity and disdain for the plebiscitary decision of the Slovene citizens, and open threats and intimidation. I

must conclude with regret that the proposal of the Slovene Assembly on dissociation did not receive understanding in the majority of the republics, although this proposal enabled each republic to autonomously decide about its future position, in accordance with its interests and possibilities, and on this basis also to decide on the form and content of the possible future life. With this proposal we did not want to order and prohibit anything to other republics, but we do not want to agree that anyone could do this to us right now. [applause]

Respected deputies, at present no country can exist in isolation. The future of every nation and state lies in the processes of voluntarily integration and cooperation. It is true that our efforts for independence and international recognition have not received much understanding in the international community so far. This has been proved by many meetings, including with leading officials of the EEC, and with US Secretary of State Baker, who arrived here with the authorization of the CSCE.

These stands have been formed on some firm assumptions and assessments that we unfortunately cannot influence significantly. It is more incomprehensible though that the Yugoslav diplomacy, which is at the moment also our diplomacy, with stands like those heard at the Berlin conference recently, and—as regards Slovenia—are not based on the real situation and facts, also contributes to this. The Presidency of Slovenia has already expressed its protest and surprise at the denunciation of and the search for foreign allies aimed against those whose interests this diplomacy should protect. It would not be sensible to criticize the world for taking such a negative stand at the moment because it merely wants to protect its interests, above all: peace. This is a reality that should have been known for a long time. I hope that it is finally clear to those people who during the plebiscite and after it until recently have been misleading Slovenes with reports of quick international recognition. I said hope because I wish that we would all give priority to hard work instead of false hopes, that is to say, to the same hard work that, long before the fall of the Berlin Wall, made us much more European, and more interesting for the democratic world than most of the former Eastern European countries. At that time we did not push unreasonably into Europe and demand political recognition, that would not be in line with the manners and principles prevailing there, and we should now receive it as a result of the previous credits we earned for our democratization and Yugoslavia's democratization. At the end of the day, we carried out this process for our own sake above all. It would be inappropriate to forget the years of hard work that actually brought us closer to Europe, and made us part of it in the economic, cognitive, informative, technological, and communicative sense. These years of hard work separated us from the parts of Yugoslavia that held different beliefs and had a different orientation and who did not want such Europeanization and were not capable of facing it, more than any declaration could. If we want to be truly independent and European, we will have to analyze the circumstances rationally and instead of haughtily rejecting the messages from abroad, which demonstrates our smallness and provincialism; we will have to prove with sensible convincing arguments, and above all with practical actions, that those assessments have no grounds, and in this way gradually create conditions for cooperation and formal recognition. Because of this logic and because of the specifics of the modern world, the Republic of Slovenia remains open to the attempts to identify the possibilities for the formation of a possible new community of the present SFRY republics, that must be essentially different from the present one as this can only be a community of sovereign states. Of course, our ambitions must not stop here. On the basis of the model of a confederal setup of Yugoslavia published last year, it would be sensible to prepare a definite offer that would require a definite stand and a clear answer from the other republics, and in this way clear up the illusion that has been created that everyone has an interest in such an equal community. This can in no way be an ambiguous proposal that would leave a way for everybody to agree on it, but for different reasons and with different expectations. That is what happened to the Gligorov-Izetbegovic proposal, which seemed to satisfy everybody and brought a lot of unrealistic hope among the domestic and foreign political public, but in reality postponed the debate on the right question—who would be the subjects of this new community and with what legal status. It is obvious for us that those can only be sovereign states with international recognition. These states, on the basis of their freely defined interests, will form a community through an international contract, and with the contract define the form and contents of its mutual relations. The starting point of this is that one can manage one's sovereignty only if one possesses this sovereignty. On this basis we wish to enter European integration as an equal partner.

In the opinion of the Slovene Presidency, it would be wise if the Republic of Slovenia in its future existence—where it will have the status of a sovereign and independent state and will as such take part in establishing interests and possibilities for a union of sovereign states on the territory of the present SFRY—above all respected the following principles: The new states that will appear with the division of the SFRY should be sovereign and they should have all authority on their territories within the existing borders of each of the present republics. The newly-formed states should mutually recognize each other as having the status of sovereign states as subjects of international law and their territorial integrity within the existing borders between them within the present Yugoslavia and within the framework of internationally recognized state borders of the present SFRY with the neighboring states. They should refrain from activities that can harm the state sovereignty and territorial integrity of other states, particularly those that involve threat with force and the use of force. These states should guarantee all their citizens equal rights and freedoms, regardless of their national

affiliation and other differences. These states should assert all rights and freedoms of the man as an individual, as well as the rights of people, national communities, and other collective rights in conformity with provisions and principles of international law. These states should guarantee ownership rights, the freedom of entrepreneurship and associating into trade unions, the free flow of commodities, persons, and labor force in conformity with the adopted international agreements and rules of the EC. These states should establish a system of collective security, including mutual activity in the field of defense and security in conformity with general efforts to finally establish peace and security in this part of Europe. These states should respect the unity of the European ecological arena and general and international norms of the protection of and respect for the environment. These states, members of the community, may also establish links with other European countries and have the right to sign bilateral and multilateral agreements. [applause]

Esteemed deputies, on the basis of these principles and upon the foundations of established interests in political and economic cooperation, as well as cooperation in the sphere of defense and international relations, cooperation and links between democratic states of the present world is possible regardless of whether this cooperation is institutionalized or not. We cannot go below this level where we are prepared for cooperation with other states, despite some second thoughts about the usefulness of and need for cooperation among the present Yugoslav peoples. Our view is rather that this region is to a certain point a defined whole, that links and cooperation on it are possible and useful, albeit not ordered as the greatest value and aim to which everything else, including sovereignty, equality of peoples, and the democratic quality of their lives, should be subjected and that it should be realized at any cost.

At the Slovene Assembly's proposal regarding consentaneous division of the SFRY, only the Republic of Croatia replied and adopted our proposal. Since it has so far been impossible to reach coordination with other republics on a community of sovereign states, in conformity with a previously announced decision, the Republic of Croatia decided to opt simultaneously with Slovenia for the proclamation of Croatia as a sovereign and autonomous state, which is, just as Slovenia is, ready to join a possible union of sovereign states—on the basis of its own interests and in its own will as a sovereign state—with other republics of the present Yugoslavia if they show interest and possibilities for doing so.

Through its representatives, Croatia has shown interest and readiness to sign an interstate agreement with the Republic of Slovenia on all those spheres where a joint interest is ascertained. We in Slovenia are also undoubtedly interested in such cooperation on the basis of equality and mutual interests. Possible institutionalized forms of this cooperation, however, are the question of expert estimates and special decisions. In any case, the cooperation between the two autonomous states should be open to other republics as well, regardless of state and legal forms and mutual relations they would organize themselves.

I propose that the Assembly of the Republic of Slovenia should as early as today recognize the autonomous and sovereign Republic of Croatia, which plans to likewise recognize the autonomous, independent, and sovereign Republic of Slovenia at today's session of the Croatian Assembly. [applause]

Honored deputies! Our promise that we are willing to negotiate and resolve the mutual relations conscientiously stems from the principles of international law, particularly the Helsinki Final Act. Political policy unable or unwilling to negotiate is bad policy and is leading toward the use of violent means, even war. We have promised our citizens that we will realize the plebiscitary decision in a peaceful and democratic way without endangering their security and peace. With constant warnings from abroad, particularly from some neighboring states who call on us to negotiate and to have patience, we cannot ignore the fact that these warnings are directed only to us, who have always been ready to negotiate and have made a series of specific proposals. Strangely enough, such warnings are not directed to those people who do not want to negotiate and who reckon on being able to use force and economic and financial pressures to keep us in the joint state and upon whose internal political and economic lives we have had no influence for a long time. This completely exhausted our economy, made us lose our economic, social, ecological, and political strength, which is needed to keep up with the pace of the urgently needed reforms, and finally justifiably questioned the very existence and future of the Slovene nation. We cannot accept a situation where the unwillingness of others to negotiate would prevent us from fulfilling our natural, constitutional, and internationally-legally grounded right to self-determination, which would also prevent us from taking the opportunity of finally taking the responsibility over the instruments of our own future in our own hands. The Helsinki Final Act is particularly binding on those countries that had signed it in regard to respect for nations' equality and their right to self determination. As the act states, all nations always have the right to completely freely, at any time, and as they wish, decide on their own internal and external political status, without interference from abroad. They also have the right to fulfill their political, economic, social, and cultural development as they wish. We can understand and fully acknowledge the interests of other nations, especially our neighbors, and their concern that the independence of the republics of the present SFRY and the regulations of the future relations between them on the basis of their complete equality and state autonomy, would not be carried out at the expense of the third party, and at the expense of peace and cooperation in Europe. Of course, we must say, that the lack of understanding for the situation in Yugoslavia—especially for the legitimate interests of each nation to secure itself its own perspective of development in such manner as it wishes—as well as the

insistence upon the unity of the present SFRY—which unfortunately counts upon, or must also count with giving legitimacy and legality to violence, even armed violence—is in effect preventing the formation of new relations and the possible new community of states in this area. By doing this they are actually endangering peace and security, here as well as in Europe. The solution to the Yugoslav problem is not without risk. It would be a greater risk to forcefully preserve Yugoslavia, however, in which the common life that is based upon the superceded ideological fundaments causes nationalist intolerance and hegemonistic ambitions of bigger nations. There is no other option left for us but to continue peacefully, thoughtfully, and firmly—even after our independence and transformation into a sovereign state—to insist upon the conscientious regulation of all relations—of the past as well as in searching for a new joint existence in the future. We are patiently explaining all this to our partners in the world.

Honored deputies! In the moment that the Republic of Slovenia is declaring its independent and sovereign status to the world, and starting its difficult path toward international recognition, the Presidency of Slovenia is also obliged to explain the extent that we are actually prepared for this path.

The Presidency of the Republic of Slovenia has for a long time, before the adoption of the plebiscitary decision and after it, warned that the most important question is the way and the extent to which Slovenia is and will be ready for the life of an autonomous and a free state based on democracy and free markets. In all our statements, including those made here in this assembly, we warned that the six-month period is extremely short for this. The time was relatively short and not everything could be forecast and planned when what is involved is the establishment of a new state and development of its complete infrastructure, particularly in such an unpleasant and doubtful international situation. We, however, cannot ignore the fact that we have been long postponing the planned and coordinated activities of the opposition parties. They were also drawn and obliged themselves through implementing the law on plebiscite to creative and responsible cooperation. We cannot ignore that the program for implementing the plebiscitary decision has not been proposed, although that was envisaged by law, and that the Assembly has never received regular, thorough, and multiparty information on the course of preparations, so that the Assembly has so far had no clear idea of how the things have been made, how they should have been made, and how they may be made.

The Presidency of the Republic has several times warned about the state of these preparations, and is of the opinion that due to the fact that their importance has more or less been overlooked, things have not been fully prepared as they could have been and must be.

I expect the president of the government to inform you in detail at today's session about the preparedness and realistic possibilities for truly assuming power in a peaceful way, and particularly about the circumstances, preparations, and planned measures to avoid real disturbances and stagnation in economy. You must have at your disposal all necessary data and information to assume the responsibility for decisions that are awaiting you.

We propose that the Assembly, now released from the responsibility of dealing with those extremely political issues, should adopt decisions that will in its opinion be necessary and sufficient for creating more successful connections between political and legal acts concerning the independence of Slovenia, and should deal with the restructuring of the Slovene economy, its market transformation, solutions to social and ecological issues, and all that is necessary for successful development of the Republic of Slovenia as a sovereign, democratic, law-governed, and social state.

If there is no sudden effort toward some very aggravated economic and social questions, things which would mean improvement of the living and working conditions of our people and a higher quality of their lives and environment, then all these efforts of ours, according to own [words indistinct] would make no sense.

What counts is effort and its results, and by no means words. This must be a joint stand of the Slovene political parties, including those in the legislature and those out of it. What is involved is not the project of one single party or group of parties, but a joint Slovene decision and joint responsibility. A society in which the key point of political activity is that one group should remove another is undemocratic, unconstitutional, unsuccessful, and therefore un-European.

Now that we have made this decisive historic step, our behavior must be led only by reason, democracy, respect of others, and faith in the best democratic and humanist traditions of the Slovene people.

I am convinced that every one of us is aware today how decisive and crucial these moments are for our people and other peoples in Yugoslavia, and that the destiny of our people and perhaps the destinies of several future generations depend on our decisions. It is not always possible to predict all consequences decisions may have. Sometimes one needs exceptional courage. Therefore, esteemed deputies, raise your hands in favor of the proposed decisions and take upon yourselves the honor and responsibility that history has given to you. Thank you very much. [applause]

Further on Kucan's Remarks

AU2606212091

[Editorial Report] Ljubljana Radio Slovene Network in Slovene at 1912 GMT on 26 Jun begins live relay of the central celebration of Slovene Independence in Ljubljana. An unnamed reporter says that many people have

gathered in the square in front of the Assembly building who applaud to the coming guests and deputies.

At 1914 GMT, the reporter says that Presidency President Milan Kucan, Assembly President France Bucar, and Government President Lojze Peterle have arrived in front of the assembly entrance, across the rostrum.

The reporter goes on to say that Milan Kucan, accompanied by Lieutenant Colonel Krkovic has inspected the unit of honor of the Slovene territorial defense. Applause is heard. The reporter says that the members of the unit of honor are wearing parade uniforms and are armed with automatic guns.

At 1916 GMT, Milan Kucan begins his speech addressing people as "Dear relatives, Esteemed citizens of the Republic of Slovenia, Honored guests, particularly the guests from the Slovene congress from Slovenia and abroad." He goes on to say that "with his birth, man is given the right to dream; with his work, he is given the right to bring life and dreams close to each other. Yesterday we connected those two for us, for many generation of Slovenes who dreamed these same dreams long ago, and for future generations who will build the new world upon these dreams. Since yesterday [applause], since yesterday, we Slovenes have our own state [cheers and applause]. Since yesterday, the majority of the Slovene people are living in its own, autonomous, and independent state [cheers and applause]."

Kucan continues to speak on Slovene history saying that "our history is honorable and clean." He goes on to say that "the present times demand different relations among the peoples living in the southeast of Europe. An agreement among sovereign peoples is the firmest warrant of peace, stability, and peoples' progress. We have not seceded, we have not gone anywhere, we have not burned bridges behind ourselves, we have not destroyed that in this community of ours which was good and pleasant to all of us."

"With yesterday's proclamation of the sovereign Slovenia we are making a very far-reaching commitment to ourselves alone—for better and for worse. Awaiting us are tough tribulations, endurance, consistence in democracy, creativity, resourcefulness, and faith to the goals that we are obliged by: democracy, freedom, respect for man's dignity and his rights, respect for minorities and immigrants, openness, and cooperation with others. By these values we shall remain obliged forever."

Further on, Kucan says that their "joy has been spoiled. Our good intentions are returned with unfounded criticism on the part of others and extraordinary repression on the part of the Yugoslav authorities. Is it possible to so quickly erase memories of everything that Slovenia shared for better and for worse with others with whom it had lived in the joint state. We are not threatening anybody. Therefore, there is no need for planes over our towns and tanks in our streets [applause]."

Kucan ends his 14-minute speech at 1930.

The reporter then says that the Yugoslav flag was struck and the Slovene flag raised, and the Slovene anthem is heard.

Live relay of the official part of the celebration ends at 1932.

Slovenia Will Defend Sovereignty With Arms

AU2706085191 Belgrade Radio Belgrade Network in Serbo-Croatian 0810 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Dragoslav Kosaric report]

[Text] Good day, in the promised land of the band called The Bulldozers, the situation is very tense and it is very uncertain [words indistinct] armored vehicles from Vrhnika proceeded toward Brnik Airport. There were also some movements of the armored vehicles of the Yugoslav People's Army in other parts of Slovenia. According to my information from Maribor, armored vehicles are (?currently moving) toward the Sentilj border crossing.

Let me also say that the city traffic in Ljubljana is gradually normalizing and that about 15 minutes ago Milan Kucan, president of the Presidency of Slovenia, addressed the nation, after an extraordinary session of the Slovene Presidency. Let me briefly say what Milan Kucan said.

The Presidency assessed, Kucan said, that, according to the order of the Fifth Army District, the Yugoslav People's Army units will take over border crossings with all means [words indistinct] represent an aggression on the sovereign Republic of Slovenia and an attempt to occupy it permanently.

Kucan said that Slovenia will reply by using all the available means to protect its sovereignty. The Presidency of Slovenia ordered the Territorial Defense of this republic, if necessary, to protect this sovereignty with arms.

The Presidency of Slovenia appealed to all citizens of the republic and the citizens who are currently officers or soldiers in the Yugoslav People's Army to refuse cooperation in the aggressive moves, as Kucan said, (?against) their own state and people.

The Presidency has also sent a request to the Federal Executive Council to stop these army activities in Slovenia. The Republic of Slovenia has decided to withdraw all its representatives to the federal organs.

Until aggression is stopped it is not possible to negotiate all those questions that refer [words indistinct] after dissociation. The Republic of Slovenia has also asked other republics, or to be more precise, the republican presidencies, to condemn the aggressive acts against the Republic of Slovenia and to ask their citizens who are (?in) the Yugoslav People's Army not to (?take part in them). Until the aggression is stopped the Republic of Slovenia, Kucan said, is forced to (?withdraw) its offer

for the continuation of talks on the creation of a community of sovereign states on the territory of present day Yugoslavia.

Slovene Interior Minister on Using Forces

LD2606211491 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1754 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Ljubljana, June 26 (TANJUG)—Slovene Interior Minister Igor Bavcar told newsmen on Wednesday that not a single measure of the Yugoslav Government "can be enforced without resorting to force".

Bavcar stressed he has on Wednesday informed by telephone Yugoslav Interior Minister Petar Gracanin about this.

The Yugoslav government on Tuesday night assessed as "one-sided, illicit and illegitimate" the acts of the assemblies of the Republics of Slovenia and Croatia on independence and sovereignty, and adopted decisions and orders which are to "ensure the functioning of the Yugoslav state and secure its existing state and internal borders."

Bavcar said he has learned, but not in the talk with Gracanin, that the federal authorities intend to form a federal brigade, which is to help realize the Yugoslav Government measures.

Stressing that Slovenia "would do all it can to establish authorities over border-crossings," Bavcar added: "If need be we will defend these points with the force we have at our disposal."

At the border-crossings toward Italy and Austria there were incidents on Wednesday between the Yugoslav People's Army and Slovene police, which began removing the signs saying Yugoslavia and putting up those with "Republic of Slovenia" written on them.

Bavcar said that the Yugoslav Army officers, who are on the territory of Slovenia, were told that "all military movements toward communications, i.e., populated areas, would be taken as aggressive acts."

According to Bavcar, the Slovene authorities in the night of Tuesday-Wednesday "without conflicts" assumed competence of three services for which the federal organs were previously competent. These were, as he said, customs and border services and the control of airport services.

Assembly Rejects Constitutional Amendments

LD2606174991 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1937 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Ljubljana, 25 Jun (TANJUG)—Although several deputies from the ranks of the opposition offered several amendments to the constitutional law for the implementation of the basic document on autonomy and independence, this act was approved by a large majority of votes. Almost all the amendments were rejected.

Among the approximately 10 amendments from the socialist, Joze Smole, an amendment against a conventional state border between the republics of Slovenia and Croatia, providing instead for only an administrative border with a free flow of people and goods, was also rejected. Smole's amendment, calling for a transitional period in which an agreement would be concluded with the Yugoslav National Bank in connection with a guarantee for the dinar and foreign currency accounts of inhabitants of Slovenia was also rejected.

The essence of a speech by Milanko Aksentijevic (a representative of the Yugoslav People's Army) was his assessment that the constitutional law is oriented towards the secession and not the dissociation of Slovenia. In other words, it is a new agreement on a community of sovereign states. Aksentijevic drew attention to the consequences of such an anti-constitutional and anti-plebiscite act.

Slovenia To Apply for UN Membership

LD2606183191 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1700 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Ljubljana [Dateline as received]—Slovene President Milan Kucan today sent a telegram to all heads of state informing them that on "25 June the Assembly of the Republic of Slovenia adopted a constitutional charter on the Republic of Slovenia's independence and sovereignty." In keeping with this decision, an independent and sovereign state of Slovenia was set up which immediately assumed full sovereignty and effective authority throughout its territory and, as the telegram says, "will apply for UN membeship." The telegram adds that "the Republic of Slovenia wishes to develop and deepen fruitful relations with all the states which will be based on reciprocal respect and interests." Proceeding from that, Slovenia wants to establish diplomatic relations as soon as possible.

Ljubljana—"This morning I rang up the federal minister for internal affairs, Petar Gracanin, and told him that the measures which he proposed during the federal government session yesterday surprised me." This was said at a press conference today by Slovene Minister of Internal Affairs Igor Bavcar. Bavcar said that the measures he was referring to proposed the closing of all but eight border crossings, the measures banning movement in the border strip, and other restrictive measures, as he described them.

Bucar said that the government cannot and does not approve these measures, stressing that none of them can be applied without the use of force. "Our stance is that we will not be the first to use force," said Bavcar.

Internal Affairs Minister Comments on Independence

AU2606151091 Belgrade Radio Belgrade Network in Serbo-Croatian 1300 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Dragan Stavljanin report]

[Text] Following the proclamation of independence, the situation in Slovenia is tense but according to leaders of this republic there have been no armed conflicts.

[Stavljanin] There have been verbal duels at most crossings on the borders with Italy, Austria, and Hungary between members of the Slovene armed forces and the Yugoslav People's Army. This was said at a news conference by Slovene Internal Affairs Minister Igor Bavcar.

The Yugoslav People's Army at this [words indistinct] near the border crossings. However, an Army unit, or more precisely a patrol, has only entered the border crossing of (?Krvavi Potok), Bavcar claimed. He added that there have not been any armed conflicts. [passage omitted]

In his words, Slovenia took over customs as of midnight without any problem as well as air traffic control. Slovenia has informed neighboring countries of these moves. Bavcar claimed that army units, particularly, armored units, are on full alert [words indistinct]. In reply to a question from journalists he said briefly that the Slovene armed forces are on the alert.

Slovene Information Minister Jelko Kacin minister could not explain the planes [words indistinct] Ljubljana because the so-called high-altitude air traffic is [words indistinct], that is, the landing and taking off of planes at Ljubljana and Maribor airports has been supervised by Slovenia since midnight.

Igor Bavcar said that he had talked on the phone with Federal Internal Affairs Secretary Petar Gracanin, and informed him that Slovenia will respond to any use of force. Bavcar added that such action would, however, reduce the chances of talks.

[Words indistinct] that the Slovene militia is supervising communication (?only in Croatia) and denied the report that Slovenia had given (?$6 million) for surface-to-surface missiles.

Foreign Affairs Minister Dimitrij Rupel said that Slovenia had only been recognized by Croatia so far and not by Bulgaria too, as had been rumored. Rupel told journalists that representatives of Austria, Norway, the Central African Republic, Thailand, Togo, and possibly Hungary had announced their attendance at this evening's independence ceremony. As Rupel said, this does not mean, however, recognition of Slovene independence (?but) recognition of the fact that it exists.

Call For Negotiations, Warning Against Force

LD2606213291 Ljubljana Radio Slovenia Network in Slovene 2000 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] The Slovene government today discussed the decisions of the federal government during its night session. In this connection, the Slovene government sent a letter to the federal cabinet saying that the assumption of certain functions previously within federal jurisdiction has been taking place peacefully. It said that it had given advance information to the federal cabinet about its decisions. No action taken by Slovenia offers ground for the use of force. Using all means at its disposal, it will prevent the use of force by others.

In its letter, the Slovene government again suggested negotiations, rather than the imposition by force of a situation it is no longer possible to return to.

Peterle's cabinet again said that Slovenia is willing to start immediate talks and negotiations for the establishment of a community of sovereign states on the territory of the present Yugoslavia.

Slovene Daily on 'Danger' to Sovereignty

LD2606125791 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1142 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Ljubljana, June 26 (TANJUG)—The Ljubljana daily NEODVISNI DNEVNIK writes today that the 'sovereignty of the Republic of Slovenia will no longer be threatened either by Federal Prime Minister Ante Markovic, or by Chief of Staff of the Yugoslav People's Army Blagoje Adzic.'

'The real danger lies in a systematic preponderance of the interests of rather small groups which can quickly turn into pressure groups, while abusing the civil society, parties and the entire state structure,' says the daily published in the Slovenian capital of Ljubljana.

Yesterday, the Slovenian Parliament proclaimed the Republic's sovereignty and declared the Yugoslav Constitution invalid in its territory.

Slovenia needs new elections, the daily points out, warning of serious consequences slovenes could suffer unless they realize soon the 'value of the self-determination principle.'

Slovenia Threatens To Mine Communications Sites

LD2706083991 Belgrade TANJUG in English 0732 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] Ljubljana, June 27 (TANJUG)—Units of the First and Second Battalions of the Yugoslav People's Army (JNA) armoured brigade at Vrhnika in western Slovenia, comprising 40 tanks and 20 transporters, started for Ljubljana at 02:45 hrs local time today, the republican Information Secretariat announced this morning.

Units of the territorial defence and the Interior Ministry of Slovenia tried by nonviolent means to stop them on the way, the statement says. The blockades slowed down but did not stop the advance of the units which split into two columns.

While breaking through the blockade, the tanks caused a vast material damage to the vehicles blocking the roads.

The columns of tanks and transporters moved along the Ljubljana ring-road to Brnik Airport. They did not, however, try to force their way into the centre of the Slovenian capital.

The statement of the republican secretariat goes on to say that units of the republican territorial defence and police have been mobilized to defend Ljubljana and were deployed in defence positions. Territorial defence units are armed with anti-armour and anti-aircraft weaponry, but have not been ordered to use the weapons.

The statement further says that, in case of more movements of JNA units, the obstacles and communication facilities will be mined.

The conduct so far of the federal government and the Yugoslav Army leadership has deepened the mistrust of the Army and made negotiations difficult, says the statement released this morning by the Slovenian Information Secretary.

Federal Authorities Close Ljubljana Airport

AU2606143791 Ljubljalna Radio Slovenia Network in Slovene 1330 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] We have already reported that the Brnik Airport has been closed since 1330 [1130 GMT]. The management of the airport stated that the airport was closed by the Federal Directorate of Air Traffic in Belgrade. Brnik Airport has not commented about this measure. It is a fact, however, that the closure of the airport has caused considerable confusion in international traffic. The management stresses that they are powerless in the affair, as the air traffic control is under the responsibility of the Federation.

Runways Blocked; Tanks Deployed

LD2706073691 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 0717 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] Ljubljana, 27 Jun (TANJUG)—All measures have been taken at Brnik Airport near Ljubljana to put runways out of action. Slovene police and members of the republic's territorial defense are concentrated in and around the main building. The runways are blocked by all sorts of vehicles to stop military aircraft from landing.

A number of Yugoslav People's Army tanks are deployed in the airport's vicinity where they arrived after either breaking through or circumventing all blockades on their way overnight from the barracks in Vrhnika.

Air Traffic Control Still in Belgrade's Hands

LD2606230591 Ljubljana Radio Slovenia Network in Slovene 2200 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] An attempt was made to ruffle today's celebrations to mark the proclamation of the state of Slovenia by moving Yugoslav Army units about on Slovene territory. These movements are a consequence of the Federal Government decisions taken during its emergency session last night. By and large, the Army was moving toward the Italian and Austrian borders, but in the direction of the Hungarian border as well. At several points the Slovene police units and local people also hampered and stopped Army movements, but we must say that fortunately there have been no really serious incidents. The material damage caused by the Yugoslav Army by its actions is certainly of considerable proportions. The federal authorities have caused a great deal of damage and have also damaged their reputation by shutting down Slovene airports. It must be realized that air traffic control is still in Belgrade's hands. Throughout the day Slovenia was being over-flown by military aircraft, at times at very low altitudes, trying to disturb the people and dampen the festive mood with the din of their jet engines.

All Slovene Airports Reported Closed

LD2606161991 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1559 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Belgrade, 26 Jun (TANJUG)—All three airports in Slovenia—Ljubljana, Maribor and Portoroz—are closed, TANJUG has learned from the JAT [Yugoslavia Airlines] control center in Belgrade. So far there is no information on when traffic will resume.

Citizen's Militia Guard Barricades in Ljubljana

AU2706063291 Vienna Oesterreich Eins Radio Network in German 0500 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Excerpt] About 40 tanks of the Yugoslav Army are moving toward the Slovene capital, Ljubljana. All roads to the city have been blocked by buses and fire brigade vehicles. The tank units are said to have already passed the airport of Brnik, about 30 km from Ljubljana. As the Austrian Broadcasting Service correspondent has reported from Ljubljana, the tanks rolled over several private cars. So far, the federal Army does not seem to have been able to occupy the airport. In the center of Ljubljana, too, all important buildings and main crossings have been blocked by trucks and buses. Strong forces of the Slovene citizens' militia with hand grenades and tank-piercing weapons are guarding the barricades. A similar blockade between Ljubljana and Kranj was broken through by force by the Army early this morning. [passage omitted]

Rupel Reveals Border Crossing 'Conflicts'

LD2606160991 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1429 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Ljubljana, 26 Jun (TANJUG)—During a press conference today Dr. Dimitrij Rupel, the republican secretary for international relations, was asked to comment on last night's Federal Executive Council decision to directly insure the implementation of federal provisions on the crossing of the state border on Slovene territory.

Asked to say whether the federal organs are already trying to carry this out and whether there is tension on the borders, Rupel confirmed that conflicts have occurred at border crossings. Slovene internal affairs organs were to set up new border signs indicating the name of the state, but were prevented from doing that by Yugoslav People's Army [JNA] personnel.

According to Slovene legislation, the army does not have the task of guarding border crossings, but only the "green strip" with the result that, Rupel said, the difference of opinion is about division of authority. Explaining the conflict between the JNA and the Slovene police in Ratece, Rupel said that it amounted to verbal sniping and that the Slovene units have been ordered not to use their arms, except in self-defense.

The Slovene government is contesting the interpretations which refer to the Slovene act of gaining independence as unilateral. In Rupel's view, this act can be referred to at least as bilateral, because Croatia has also declared independence. Dr. Rupel also said that Slovenia is ready for a dialogue, but is not willing to listen to ultimatums issued by other foreign countries, such as Yugoslavia, because Slovenia has its own government, legislature, and other state organs. If Slovene citizens do not get service from the Yugoslav system and the federal secretariat for foreign affairs, then this means, according to Dr. Rupel, that Yugoslavia recognizes Slovenia as a state.

Border Situation 'Normal'

LD2606112191 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1105 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Ljubljana, June 26 (TANJUG)—In addition to border police, control at Yugoslavia's border crossings with Austria, Italy and Hungary in the area of Slovenia is also exercised by members of the republic's territorial defence.

The situation at the crossings is normal and there are no delays in traffic, a spokesman for the Slovenian Interior Secretariat said. Passengers and vehicles are crossing the borders without restriction.

Round-the-clock service at the secretariat has received no reports about removal of border stones with the inscription 'SFRJ' (Serbo-Croatian abbreviation for Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia) in the border regions, or substitution of the Slovenian flags for those of Yugoslavia.

Combat readiness of the Yugoslav Army troops in the territory of this Yugoslav Republic was raised this morning.

Border With Italy Closed

AU2606103891 Belgrade Radio Belgrade Network in Serbo-Croatian 1000 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Dragoslav Kosaric report from the Kozina border crossing]

[Text] [Kosaric] The situation is very tense at the Krvavi Potok border crossing near Kozina. Units of the republican militia wanted to replace the sign that bears the names of SFRY and the Republic of Slovenia with a sign that bears only the name of Slovenia and a new coat of arms.

Two hours before this incident, this border crossing was surrounded by members of a Yugoslav People's Army's unit who warned the customs officers that they will take the new markings by force if they put them up.

The traffic on this border crossing has been stopped. New markings have not been put up, but members of the special unit of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Slovenia are inside the customs office building and around it. The Italians have closed the border crossing from their side and are diverting passengers to other crossings.

I have learned unofficially that the Slovene Government intended to do the same thing at the Lipica border crossing, but was prevented in the same way. So far there is a status quo, but tensions are rising from minute to minute, even though the head of the Yugoslav People's Army unit has said that the use of arms is out of question, but the issue is the protection of the official legitimate internationally recognized markings of Yugoslavia.

Slovene Insignia at Ljubelj Border

LD2606123291 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1208 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Ljubljana, 26 Jun (TANJUG)—At the Ljubelj border crossing the insignia and the state flag of the SFRY were overnight replaced by those of Slovenia.

Slovene police and customs officials have ignored warnings by the Yugoslav People's Army representatives to restore the legitimate Yugoslav border signs. The police were keeping watchful guard while the majority of customs officials are idle as a result of the drastic fall in the number of vehicles crossing the border at Ljubelj.

Vienna Radio Reports Army Actions in Slovenia

AU2706065391 Vienna Oesterreich Eins Radio Network in German 0500 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Austrian Broadcasting Service Yugoslavia correspondent Gerhard Seifried report]

[Text] It was the most brutal action committed by the Yugoslav People's Army in Slovenia so far. While in the city center of Ljubljana independence was being loudly celebrated, only a few kilometers away army tanks rolled over private cars. Around 0200 in the morning it became known that about 30 tanks from the barracks in Vrhnika were moving toward Ljubljana. The people were called upon via radio to erect road blocks. Close to the southwest city border of Ljubljana the tanks rolled over several private cars; some of them were flattened; a police car was also completely destroyed. The scratches

made by the tank chains are clearly visible on the tarmac. Shocked car owners stood in front of the wrecks of their cars.

Shortly after 0600 a column of at least two tanks and several armored personnel carriers moved on the Ljubljana highway toward the north. I followed them with an Austrian camera team—2 km before the toll station the tanks stopped briefly; the highway was blocked by trucks. As a result, they left the highway and continued on a secondary road—watched by worried citizens on the roadside.

Enraged people have blocked the exit roads from Ljublana with their cars; trucks can also be seen, as well as city buses. They are supposed to prevent the tanks from entering the city. Private cars are permitted to pass.

The Slovene Republic leadership is facing the most difficult situation since the first democratic elections last year.

Gligorov Sends Message to Kucan

LD2706074191 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1734 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Skopje, 26 Jun (TANJUG)—The office of the Macedonian president announced tonight that President Kiro Gligorov has sent a telegram to Milan Kucan, president of the Presidency of the Republic of Slovenia, in which Gligorov thanks him for his invitation to attend the ceremony of proclaiming Slovenia an autonomous, sovereign, and independent state.

"The decision to proclaim the republic an autonomous, independent, and sovereign state is the expression of the will articulated by Slovenia's citizens in the referendum of 23 December 1990. In these historic moments for the existence and survival of the Yugoslav community, the Republic of Macedonia, for one, will continue its efforts to maintain dialogue with all the Yugoslav republics, and strive to reach a new [word indistinct] of constituting Yugoslavia as an alliance of sovereign states. To this effect we are willing to continue our talks with representatives of the Republic of Slovenia about all issues in the interests of a peaceful and demcoratic solution to the current crisis," says Gligorov's message.

Tanks Break Through Ljubljana Blockade of Buses

LD2706062491 Belgrade TANJUG in English 0540 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] Ljubljana, June 27 (TANJUG)—Close to the town of Novo Mesto, near the border between Slovenia and Croatia, an Army non-com got lightly wounded in a clash with Slovenia's territorial defense members, the Slovene Radio newscast [sentence as received]. The shooting broke out when a column of Army vehicles was stopped at the approaches to the town.

Yugoslav Army tanks broke through a blockade of city buses positioned at an exit from Ljubljana and rolled on moving toward the local Brnik Airport, Radio Ljubljana broadcast this morning, referring to Igor Bavcar, Slovenia's secretary of home affairs.

At about four o'clock this morning, Slovenia's territorials and police blocked Ljubljana and approaches to the city. The blockade followed bits of news about movements of tanks and Yugoslav Army units.

Ljubljana is still (?blocked). Taxi service is not functioning, (?but) urban traffic is [words indistinct].

According to radio [word indistinct] newscast, the situation at frontier crossings between Yugoslavia and [words indistinct]. Being seen close to major frontier crossings are tanks and (?armed) [word indistinct] of the Yugoslav Army.

Tanks 'Dispersed Throughout' Ljubljana Area

LD2706060191 Ljubljana Radio Slovenia Network in Slovene 0430 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] We have not received any major news over the last 30 minutes, so let us repeat what we have been reporting on so far. Yugoslav Army armored units have been on the move throughout the night. They have left Vrhnika, heading for Brnik [Ljubljana airport]. A number of road barricades [words indistinct] in the Ljubljana area. As republican Secretary for Internal Affairs Igor Bavcar said, the Slovene police are firm in their resolve to stop them by nonviolent means. [passage indistinct] are armored units.

According to an unofficial report, which has not been checked out yet, the tanks appear to have been stopped, and it also seems that the columns have broken up, so the tanks are now dispersed throughout the greater area of Ljubljana. Armored units have been on the move in Dolenjska, too. They were carving their way from the direction of Metlika via Gorjanci, but they were halted outside Novo Mesto. A shoot-out took place, in the course of which an officer of the Yugoslav Peoples' Army [JNA] was allegedly injured.

Let us also say that a great number of JNA soldiers are convincingly in favor of the Slovene Territorial Defense, as they do not want to use their firearms. Let us also add that the situation at border crossings is a completely normal one, and that there are bus services to and from Ljubljana.

Army Breaks Through Vrpolje Barricades

LD2606211991 Ljubljana Radio Slovenia Network in Slovene 2000 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Summary] Our correspondent, Marijan Robas, has just told us that armored personnel carriers have broken the blockade in the village of Vrpolje and then proceeded to Vipava Barracks. The Army men took with them two local men, but they were later both released. However,

there are still seven barricades on the highway and other local roads which local people are using to try to halt possible Army movement through Vipava Valley toward Nova Gorica and the border crossings there. There is no indication how the involvement with the Yugoslav Army in Ajdovscina and Vipavak will be resolved.

No Border Crossings Closed; Barricades Erected

AU2606210491 Belgrade Radio Belgrade Network in Serbo-Croatian 2000 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] TANJUG reports that no border crossings have been closed. Several tanks and armored vehicles of the Yugoslav People's Army arrived tonight at the international border crossings of Lipica and Fernetici. At several places between Kozina and Koper and Razdrto and (?Vrtojba), the Slovene police, members of the territorial army, and local citizens erected barricades in order to prevent the movement of tanks and personnel carriers of the Yugoslav People's Army.

Slovenia Protest Over Troop Movements

LD2606185791 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1804 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Ljubljana, 26 June (TANJUG)—We consider the movement of Yugoslav People's Army [JNA] units in Slovenia to be calculated to unnecessarily alarm our citizens. This was stated during his press conference tonight by Jelko Kacin, Slovene republican secretary for information. He said that protests have been dispatched to military commands, along with demands to stop these movements. Kacin said the movements are in the direction of the Italian and Austrian borders. The airports of Brnik (Ljubljana), Maribor and Portoroz were closed in the afternoon (?on the order) of the civil aviation administration. Air force aircraft have been flying over Slovenia throughout the day, which can be interpreted to mean, he said, that they are honoring Slovene independence.

Kacin said that these movements are on a larger scale than usual and include armored carriers and this is causing road traffic delays. He did not comment on a remark that JNA tanks have reached as far as Lipica.

Slovenia Appeals for Loyalty of Army Personnel

LD2606193591 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1837 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Ljubljana, 26 Jun (TANJUG)—The Slovene republican national defense secretariat has sent a message to officers and other Yugoslav Army military personnel saying that "the Republic of Slovenia does not promise Army officers on active duty the impossible." However, it will secure for them, the statement says, the social and status rights they have attained, on condition of their loyalty to the Republic of Slovenia if they wish to go on working here. This has been laid down quite clearly in the constitutional law for the implementation of the independence decision passed by the Slovene Assembly yesterday. The republican defense secretariat also appeals to all officers not to be taken in by those who unnecessarily want to create a tense conflict situation with the use of force and provocations, which blocks the road chosen by Slovenia—the road to democracy.

Croatia

Mesic Says Army Unlikely To Shoot

LD2606212291 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1942 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Zagreb, 26 Jun (TANJUG) In tomorrow's issue of VJESNIK, [SFRY Presidency member from Croatia] Stipe Mesic—when asked whether the latest events and "attack by terrorists in Glina is the beginning of a wide-scale interethnic conflicts"—said: "No, this is not the beginning of wide-scale conflicts. This is a conflict between the police and infiltrated terrorists. I still claim that there is no conflict between Serbs and Croats. There are only conflicts between infiltrated terrorists and [words indistinct] That is simply not true. Croatia is not accepted by Chetnik units which are armed and instructed to wage terror."

Asked whether there is a danger of the Yugoslav Peoples Army starting to shoot, Mesic said: "The Army is always present, but it does not shoot, nor [passage indistinct] and it does not have the supreme commander. Any shooting would thus be outside the institutional framework." [passage indistinct]

Assembly Suspends Laws; Breaks Until July

LD2606201491 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1915 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Summary] Zagreb, 26 June (TANJUG)—The Croatian Assembly has suspended more than 40 SFRY laws on the territory of Croatia. The suspended laws include a block of laws pertaining to national defense, the system and range of activity by state administration and federal organs, finance, foreign affairs, judiciary and administration, public information and energy.

Also suspended were laws on the National Defense Council of the SFRY Presidency, regulations on armaments and military equipment manufacture and trade, military schools and institutions, and laws on military courts and the military prosecutor's office.

In the opinion of the Croatian Assembly, the suspensions flow from Article 4 of the constitutional decision on the sovereignty and independence of the Republic of Croatia.

With these decisions, Assembly ends a series of sessions during the past seven days at which many laws and decisions were made and a sovereign and independent state was proclaimed.

It was announced that the Assembly will resume its sessions next month.

Babic Expects More Trouble in Krajina

LD2606165991 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1429 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Summary from poor reception] Knin, 26 Jun (TANJUG)—During a news conference today, after the Krajina Serbian Autonomous Region [SAR] government session, its president, Dr. Milan Babic, said that although the Croatian leadership gave guarantees that dissociation from Yugoslavia would occur peacefully and democratically, they flagrantly violated the guarantees only a few hours after adopting them. "The act of dissociation started with an incident, that is, with Republic of Croatia police and Armed Forces incursion into the SAR Krajina territory. According to as yet incomplete information, people have been injured and killed in these clashes." Babic went on to say that Krajina will use all the resources at its disposal to defend its territory and the people living there. Asked by the journalists whether he expects similar attacks on other parts of Krajina, such as those which occurred in Glina and Dvor na Uni last night, Babic replied that attacks by Croatian military forces are continuing and are being stepped up every day. These are by regular police and special units and the Croatian Guards. We have information, said Babic, that these units are being equipped with assorted weapons to conduct major and large operations. We are getting ready to defend ourselves against these Croatian forces. We also expect the Yugoslav People's Army as the single SFRY armed forces to defend the SFRY territory and prevent interethnic (?conflicts), and to do so on the basis of the state Presidency decision, stressed Babic. He went on to say that Bosanka Krajina is in a state of preparedness as well, and as far as the Bosanko Grahovo meeting tomorrow between the representatives of the assemblies of both Krajinas is concerned he said he expects the assemblies to verify the agreement on their integration and mutual cooperation.

Srem Municipalities Want Militia Units

LD2606165491 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1323 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Ruma, 25 Jun (TANJUG)—The chairmen of the assemblies of nine municipalities in Srem—Sid, Beocin, Sremski Karlovci, Sremska Mitrovica, Ruma, Pecinci, Irig, Indjija, and Stara Pazova—have sent, from a joint meeting with national deputies held in Ruma, a request to Federal Executive Committee [FEC] Ante Markovic and to Internal Affairs Federal Secretary Petar Gracanin. The request asks that the permanent presence of special units of the Federal Secretariat for Internal Affairs, with the necessary authority to act in an operational way in the area of Slavonija, Baranja, and Western Srem, be ensured.

It is pointed out that this is the only way to establish peace for the imperiled inhabitants of the villages of Jankovci, Berak, Sotin, Brsadin, Srijemske Laze, Bobota, Borovo, Vukovar, and some other villages with a Serbian population.

The statement sent to the FEC president and the Federal Secretary for internal affairs from this meeting says, among other things, that the anti-Serbian and secessionist policy of the Croatian Democratic Community inspired authorities [words indistinct] the provision of assistance on a self-organized basis to the imperiled Serbian population in Croatia.

Croatian Party Votes Against Sovereignty Act

LD2606141391 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1711 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Zagreb, 25 Jun (TANJUG)—About 50 deputies in the Party of Democratic Changes of Croatia [Stranka Demokratskih Promjena—SDP] this evening voted against the draft act on the proclamation of the sovereign and autonomous republic of Croatia.

The standpoint of the party was explained by its chairman Ivica Racan, who assessed that there is no mention in the documents of initiating, along with the launching of procedure for dissociation, a procedure for association into an alliance of sovereign republics as well. By proceeding in this way, Racan believes, the policy of Croatia will not obtain and acquire as many allies as it could in Yugoslavia and Europe, and the arguments of those speaking for secession are strengthened.

The votes of the SDP of Croatia against ranged between 48 and 51, depending on the documents approved. However, the decisions were adopted, as Ivan Vekic, who was presiding at this evening's session, said, "with a majority of votes in favor", although the votes were not counted.

Krajina Demands Croatian Forces Withdraw

LD2606154391 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1503 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Knin, 26 Jun (TANJUG)—In connection with the Croatian Assembly decision on the creation of a sovereign and independent Republic of Croatia, the government of the Serbian Autonomous Region [SAR] of Krajina today stated that it holds that the status of the thus proclaimed Republic of Croatia can be regulated only within the SFRY, of which the SAR of Krajina is a constituent part, because this act of the Croatian Assembly is a unilateral act and, in essence, is tantamount to secession from the SFRY.

In a statement issued after several hours of discussion, the government states that the latest aggression by the police and military forces in the Republic of Croatia on the territory of the SAR of Krajina, in Glina and Dvor na Uni, is not just an act of aggression against the SAR of Krajina, but also against all Serbian people in the SFRY.

The government of the SAR of Krajina today sent an ultimatum demanding unconditional and immediate withdrawal of all police and military forces of the Croatian Republic from the territory of the SAR of Krajina, the statement concludes.

'Terrorists' Abduct Croat, Serb Policemen

LD2606150391 Zagreb Radio Croatia Network in Serbo-Croatian 1300 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Following a few peaceful days in the Zadar area, terrorists have again done their dirty deeds, (Bozidar Pladnic) reports. Uniformed outlaws started their (?activity) early this morning in Obrovac. Unexpectedly, and without any reason, they broke into aparments belonging to Croats and searched for arms. They took away guns and pistols legally owned by the citizens. Slogans calling on Serbs to rise were noticed this morning in Obrovac. A large number of Martic's men [Milan Martic is head of the Krajina Secretariat for Internal Affairs] who were in Obrovac headed in the direction of Knin and Mt. Velebit in coaches around 1000 [0800 GMT].

In the village of Gornji Zemunik, near Zadar, uniformed terrorists broke into a house belonging to a policeman Peter Svelja, a Serb. After harassing him and his family, they took him away in an unknown direction. This morning, in the center of Benkovac, they abducted a member of the Stankovac police outpost, Marko Nijic, a Croat. At the time of the abduction, Nijic was in civilian clothes [words indistinct].

All this has caused additional disquiet among the population of this part of Croatia, because terrorists are now endangering the lives of both Croats and Serbs.

Serbian Reservists on Alert in Dvor na Uni

LD2606153191 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1344 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Summary] Bosanski Novi, 26 Jun (TANJUG)—Dvor na Uni, a little town on the Croatian-Bosnia-Hercegovinian border, in Banija, has been abandoned since this morning. Women and children have gone into exile in Bosnia-Hercegovina, and only armed men can be seen in the town. The bridge that divides Bosanski Novi and Dvor na Uni has been blocked since this morning. A psychosis of expectation prevails in the town. This psychosis has been fueled by the clash that broke out in Glina this morning. Armed Serbian reservists are on maximum alert. There are rumors that armed clashes could occur during the night in this town as well. It is difficult to assess, however, whether what is behind these forecasts is a firm knowledge of what may happen, or whether there is fear behind it.

Dvor na Uni Declares State of Emergency

LD2606204391 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1947 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Summary] Dvor na Uni, 26 Jun (TANJUG)—The executive councils of the Dvor na Uni and Kostajnica municipal assemblies, both members of the Serbian Autonomous Region of Krajina, this evening introduced a state of emergency. Since the introduction of the state of emergency, enterprises and institutions in these two municipalities are not working and women and children are fleeing to safer places. The Krajina police are enforcing law and order in Dvor na Uni, while members of the Croatian internal affairs ministry are policing Kostajnica.

Kostajnica Declares State of Emergency

LD2606184991 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1900 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Kostajnica, 26 Jun (TANJUG)—At today's session, the presidency and executive council of the Konstajnica Municipal Assembly proclaimed a state of emergency on the territory of the municipality. They ordered the formation of the unarmed voluntary units to be placed on full alert to protect the populations. (Kostajnica is on the Croatian-Bosnian border, 45 km southeast of Sisak.)

According to a statement from the session, the emergency measure means the introduction of round-the-clock guards, surveillance and reporting about events on the territory of the municipality, [word indistinct] including enterprises, institutions and local municipal buildings, and the introduction of measures to evacuate and protect people, property, and material goods.

The presidium and executive council of the Kostajnica Municipal Assembly believes the political situation in the Banija-Kordun region is very critical, due to—the statement says—constant state terrorism waged by the Croatian leadership [words indistinct].

If units of the Croatian Internal Affairs Ministry and the Croatian National Guard do not withdraw immediately, a full-blown intranational conflict could occur, which would have negative consequences, the statement warned.

The presidum and executive council condemns most sharply all unilateral acts and acts of terror, and the aggression of the Croatian leadership, and they stress that the Serbian people on the territory of Kostajnica municipality will oppose all such [words indistinct] for the protection of the Serbian national identity and the right of the Serbian nation to self-determination.

We call on the Croat people not to (?support policies) of the Croatian leadership, because support for such a policy does not guarantee prospects for any nation, the

statement from the session of the presidium of the executive council of the Kostajnica Municipal Assembly says.

Krajina Wants Unification With Serbia

LD2606201291 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1800 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Knin, June 26 (TANJUG)—Milan Babic, prime minister of the "Serbian Autonomous Region of Krajina" (SAO) in the Yugoslav Republic of Croatia, evaluated today that conditions were ripe for the unification of this region with Serbia.

"Conditions became ripe after last night's decisions by Slovenian and Croatian parliaments on departure from Yugoslavia", Babic told a news conference in Knin, the centre of the region that is not recognized by the Croatian authorities.

The assemblies of the Yugoslav Republics of Slovenia and Croatia last night declared independence, virtually seceding themselves from Yugoslavia.

Babic stressed the SAO Krajina would remain within Yugoslavia "if it remains the state" and that it would employ all means to defend "its territory and people inhabiting it".

The SAO Krajina is made up of predominantly Serbian-populated municipalities in Croatia.

Serbs, who account for 11 per cent of Croatia's population, maintain that (?the) republican constitution jeopardizes their rights because their status of a nation had been reduced to that of a national minority, hence they proclaimed the SAO Krajina and took a decision on the region's unification with Serbia, Yugoslavia's biggest republic.

Today, Babic confirmed to newsmen that last night several people were killed or wounded in a clash between Croatian policemen and Serb civilians in the town of Glina, 70 kilometres south from the Croatian capital of Zagreb.

According to Babic, the clash occurred when "police and military forces of the Republic of Croatia broke into the territory of the SAO Krajina."

Assistant Croatian Interior Minister Josko Moric told reporters today that this clash began at 05:15 this morning when "armed civilians attacked a police patrol that found shelter in the police station."

The clash was ended as Yugoslav Army units arrived.

Attack on Glina Police 'Meticulously Planned'

LD2706035591 Zagreb Radio Croatia Network in Serbo-Croatian 0300 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] All the parties taking part in the talks conducted in Glina yesterday—representatives of the Ministry for Internal Affairs, the Army, and the Municipal Assembly of Glina—agree that the attack on the police patrol, and later on Glina's police station, was meticulously planned and organized over a long period of time, the head of the police administration of Sisak, Djuro Brodarac, said at a news conference last night.

He said that the attackers used highly modern weaponry, including mortars and anti-armor grenades. This was thus in no sense the Serbian people's spontaneous resistance in the face of threats. In Brodarec's estimate, this was rather an organized attack, mounted by about 400 uniformed individuals and civilians.

Croatia Says Four Killed in 26 Jun Clashes

LD2606192591 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1832 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Summary] Zagreb, 26 Jun (TANJUG)—Milan Brezak, Croatian assistant minister of internal affairs, told journalists tonight that four people were killed today during armed clashes in Glina and Brsadin. According to the Ministry of Internal Affairs, those killed in Glina are Tomislav Rom, a reserve police member in Glina; Miladin Ilic, a civilian and Dragisa Stefanovic, who Brezak said was a uniformed terrorist. Simo Ponjevic, an employee of the federal secrtariat of internal affairs, until recently employed in the Vukovar police station, was killed in Brsadin. Ten people were injured during the armed clash in Glina, including one policeman.

Glina 'Quiet' After Army Intervention

LD2606181391 Zagreb Radio Croatia Network in Serbo-Croatian 1700 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Excerpts] According to the latest information, Glina is peaceful this afternoon. Forces of the Croatian Ministry for Internal Affairs and the JNA [Yugoslav Peoples Army] are controlling all approaches to the town.

Here is our reporter:

[Reporter] Glina is quiet today. Today's lull could turn into desired peace or into fresh conflict tonight. [passage omitted]

Shots were fired for several hours in and around Glina. The forces of the Croatian Ministry for Internal Affairs succeeded in getting terrorists out of the Glina Police Station, but the terrorists destroyed the interior to a large extent. Several people died and several sustained injuries in the shooting. Ten injured people were moved to Sisak Hospital. Two have died, one is seriously injured and one was released from the hospital following medical treatement. Both Croatian policemen and outlaws were injured. It is difficult to say how many outlaws were wounded because many did not seek medical help. A number of the wounded were transfered from Glina to Zagreb. [passage omitted]

JNA units from the Petrinja Garrison entered Glina this morning. Traffic towards Glina is strictly controlled.

Glina itself resembles a closed town. The police and army are controlling the traffic. We have seen arrested terrorists. They are either very young people, obviously indoctrinated by greater Serbian and Chetnik ideas, or middle-aged men. [passage omitted]

Domestic Journalists Barred From Glina

AU2606135891 Belgrade Radio Belgrade Network in Serbo-Croatian 1300 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Zeljko Mandic report]

[Excerpt] The situation in Glina is still very grave and complex despite the fact that, according to our information, shooting (?stopped) about 1100 [0900 GMT]. There are many soldiers on the streets. Helicopters are flying over Glina and the entire region. In brief, this is all we have managed to learn about the situation in the town itself. [words indistinct] all road accesses are blocked by members of special units of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Croatia and, as we were told, members of the Yugoslav People's Army.

We managed to come to only a few kilometers away from Glina but could not go further as a group of armed civilians and members [words indistinct] told us to go back to Sisak where we are now reporting from. They told us to go back because [words indistinct] reporting [words indistinct] some foreign colleagues were allowed to go there. Asked whether it was logical that our citizens, citizens of Yugoslavia, should learn about the situation in their country from foreign media, the leader of this group did not give us a (?specific) answer.

In a longer conversation with members of the Croatian Ministry for Internal Affairs and armed civilians who were gathered there, we learned that there are many wounded and killed members among the town's police force. It is impossible to confirm this information, because we cannot enter the town, it should be taken [words indistinct].

We learned from the same source that citizens are moving their homes and leaving the area. We also saw columns of cars. Let us also say that people can leave town but cannot enter it because of the road blocks. People who decide to leave will not be able to go back. This is all for now from this crisis-ridden area, an area that is in a state of fear and uncertainty. How long this will last is impossible to say. [passage omitted]

Serbia's Jovic Denounces Slovene, Croatian Acts

AU2606190991 Belgrade RTV Sat TV in Serbo-Croatian 1610 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Statement by Borisav Jovic, president of the Socialist Party of Serbia—live or recorded]

[Text] The highest political organs of Slovenia and Croatia have made the unilateral acts of secession that are leading to a forceful and crude disintegration of the Yugoslav state community and in this way led the peoples and citizens of Yugoslavia to the brink of a catastrophe.

They did this at the very moment when intensive political negotiations aimed at achieving a democratic and peaceful solution for establishing new relations in our common state were going on. They did this at the moment when the entire democratic world was sending the most serious warnings against taking unilateral and forced moves that would cause clashes and catastrophe, and asking us to preserve a united and democratic Yugoslavia.

They did this at the moment of a great economic crisis with grave social consequences for all citizens of our country. We were offered the most specific aim and support to resolve it under only one condition, that Yugoslavia remain united and democratic and that it resolve its problems in a peaceful, democratic, and legal means.

All this has been ignored by the forces who care more about the outdated values and symbols from past centuries than the real development of democratic relations, joining democratic integration in Europe, and solving economic problems. Instead of democratic reforms, Yugoslavia has been offered retrograde nationalism and narrow uncivilized particularism. Instead of joining in European cooperation and the democratic world's modern living conditions, the Yugoslav peoples are being sent toward clashes among one another and international suspicion and isolation. Instead of urgently resolving serious economic and social problems, with the support and help of democratic Europe and the entire world, the Yugoslav citizens are being forcefully led by unilateral decisions toward the wasteland of further economic backwardness. Instead of the right of all peoples to decide their own fates being realized in a democratic and legal way, through a democratic and legal procedure, and through the equal participation of all peoples of the Yugoslav community, they resorted to the crudest political imposition, unilateral decisions and the policy of the fait accompli. Such behavior is unacceptable and must be opposed.

The declarations and acts of the Assemblies of the Republic of Croatia and Slovenia on the proclamation of independence and sovereignty of these two republics are unilateral and unconstitutional acts that represent the illegal acts of secession. These acts of Slovenia and Croatia have violated in the crudest way the borders, territorial integrity, and entirety of Yugoslavia. They have endangered the constitutional equality of the peoples and nationalities and peace and safety of all citizens.

The Socialist Party of Serbia stresses that these acts particularly endangered the basic national rights of the Serbian people in Croatia, who expressed through a plebiscite the political will to stay in Yugoslavia. Nothing can force them not to realize their political will.

The organs of Yugoslavia are duty bound to protect them in the realization of their national rights and political will.

The decisions of the Assemblies of the Republic of Croatia and Slovenia are neither valid at home nor abroad. The SFRY Presidency, the SFRY Assembly, and the Federal Executive Council, and other federal organs, are duty bound to undertake all available measures in accordance with their constitutional responsibilities to protect and defend the freedom, independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, and equality of all peoples and nationalities, as well as the peace and safety of all citizens of Yugoslavia.

Demanding that resolute measures be taken to eliminate the grave consequences that have arisen as a result of the unilateral and unconstitutional acts of Slovenia and Croatia, the Socialist Party of Serbia has on several occasions stressed its stand and repeats it again that the right of every people to self-determination, including the right to secession, is indisputable, but that in our multiethnic community it can only be realized in a constitutional and legal way without violating the same rights of others.

If they want to realize their rights, the Croatian and Slovene peoples can realize them through the constitutional and legal procedures that should be agreed on. In order to avoid being drawn into a wasteland, it is necessary to return to the road of reason. Unconstitutional acts must be prevented with the measures of the rule of law, in order to return to the road of a peaceful and democratic dialogue on all problems and avoid the dangers of a general catastrophe before which our community has found itself.

Izetbegovic on Croatian, Slovene Independence

AU2606192691 Belgrade Radio Belgrade Network in Serbo-Croatian 1700 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Sunita Bosnic report from Sarajevo]

[Text] Having briefed the Assembly on the essence of the talks between the six [presidents] in Stojcevac and his meetings with Tudjman and Milosevic in Split and Belgrade, as well as his talks with James Baker, President Alija Izetbegovic of Bosnia-Hercegovina suggested to the Assembly deputies with regard to the decisions by Croatia and Slovenia on dissociation that they take the following stands:

[Begin Izetbegovic recording] First, by their acts of independence, Croatia and Slovenia have made use of their right to self-determination and despite the fact that we are not pleased with this act, we in principle do not have any objection regarding the legitimacy of these acts. [applause]

Second, in adopting the aforementioned acts there are elements of unilateralist behavior, which is something that could cause difficulties. In order to have as few difficulties in the future as possible, we expect the Governments of Croatia and Slovenia in all their future actions and work connected with dissociation to respect the principle of reciprocity and to realize their rights in a way in which they fully respect the rights of the others. [end recording]

Rugova Views Croatian, Slovene Independence

AU2606213391 Zagreb Radio Croatia in Albanian 2045 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Statement by Ibrahim Rugova, chairman of the Kosovo Democratic Alliance—recorded]

[Text] We, as a democratic alliance, welcome all democratic acts that respect the will and desire of peoples to live in freedom, regardless of whether they remain tied to the Yugoslav state or not. On this occasion, I wish to say that when the Republic of Kosovo was announced, unfortunately no one in Yugoslavia officially recognized it, apart from Jozef Pucnik's Demos party in Slovenia. Regardless of the fact that they did not recognize us, we respect the will of peoples, and demand that our will also will in the future be respected, because we too have our republic or state, if it remains within the present framework of the Yugoslav state. I think that this step will be accepted with respect in Kosovo and with the desire that the will of all peoples will be respected, not only that of the Slovenes and Croats.

As for our stand for the future, we can say that the destruction of Yugoslavia, which has now de facto begun with the declaration of Slovenia and Croatia as independent republics, means that if other republics declare independence, we Albanians who live in different republics will be faced with the problem not only of the Republic of Kosovo but that of all the Albanians in Yugoslavia. Thus, at a Yugoslav level, Yugoslavia's final destruction will pose the question of the Albanians at the Balkan or regional level.

Assembly Urges 'Protection for Serbs in Croatia'

LD2706043591 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2235 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Belgrade, June 26 (TANJUG)—The parliament of the Yugoslav Republic of Serbia on Wednesday sharply condemned the decisions of Slovenia and Croatia on independence and urged 'protection for Serbs in Croatia.'

Minister for ties with Serbs outside Serbia Stanko Cvijan said that guarantees should be requested during the night from the federal Interior Ministry and the Army that Serbs in Croatia will be protected.

If such protection fails to materialize, measures should be taken by Serbia, Cvijan said.

Deputies of the Serbian Renewal Movement (SRM), the strongest opposition party in parliament, said that they

were 'prepared to offer 110,000 people for a National Guard should it be necessary to form one.'

The SRM called on Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic to have talks with the leaders of parties in Serbia on Thursday.

The parliament session resumes tomorrow when draft conclusions on the situation in the country following Slovenia's and Croatia's proclamations of independence will be presented.

Serbia To Respect Law Where Krajina Concerned

LD2606163491 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1500 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Belgrade, 26 Jun (TANJUG)—Serbia is for the respect of the rule of law and should not adopt decisions contradicting this principle. Serbia has supported the Serbs in Krajina and the wish of the Serbian people to live in Yugoslavia with all others wanting to live in it. The Serbian Assembly has expressed its unambigious support on three occasions.

This was stated today by Aleksandar Bakocevic, president of the Serbian Assembly, at a news conference. Bakocevic was answering the question whether, following Slovenia and Croatia's decisions yesterday conditions are met for the Serbian Assembly to endorse the decision of the Serbian Autonomous Region of Krajina to join Serbia.

Bosnian Koljevic Supports Krajina Protocol

LD2606170591 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1527 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Banja Luka, 25 Jun (TANJUG)—An agreement on cooperation between Bosanska Krajina and the Serbian Autonomous Region of Krajina [SAOK] is a legal act, but their political association would be illegal.

This is the key assessment of Dr. Nikola Koljevic, a member of the Presidency of the Socialist Republic of Bosnia-Hercegovina, regarding yesterday's signing of this document in his talks today with Banja Luka journalists. He added that this, at the same time, represents the stand of the Serbian Democratic Party [Srpska Demokratska Stranka] of Bosnia-Hercegovina, in which he is a member of the Executive Committee.

In his statement, Dr. Kiljevic went on to stress that "the political association of the SAOK with the community of municipalities of Bosanska Krajina would represent a political fait accompli, which has already brought this country to the brink of catastrophe. After all, the only way out of the Yugoslav crisis is a return to the Federal constitution and laws and a restoration of all the functions of the legal state organs and not unilateral acts." [passage omitted]

Macedonia

Macedonian Assembly Views 'Immediate' Secession

AU2606214391 Belrade Radio Belgrade Network in Serbo-Croatian 2000 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Boris Djordjioski report]

[Text] The Macedonian Assembly is currently discussing the current situation in the country. A tumultuous debate is being held on the proposal by representatives of the VMRO-Democratic Party for Macedonian National Unity that Macedonia today immediately proclaim its independence and autonomy, as was done by Croatia and Slovenia. Boris Djordjioski reports:

[Djordjioski] Macedonia will continue to strive for the continuation of the talks on the future of Yugoslavia as a union of sovereign states, and supports the measures proposed by the Federal Executive Council for the preservation of Yugoslavia. This position was presented this evening by the republican premier Dr. Nikola Kljusev, who stressed that the republican government has prepared all the necessary acts for the independence of Macedonia if the talks fail.

Representatives of the VMRO-Democratic Party for Macedonian National Unity, however, presented their proposal that Macedonia immediately, today, tonight, proclaim its independent status and offered the text of a resolution. They said that this was a historic chance for Macedonia to separate from a Yugoslavia that no longer exists, adding that what was left can only be called Serboslavia.

Ljupco Georgijevski, leader of the VMRO, said that failure to understand that Yugoslavia no longer exits is political blindness and that the time is right to settle accounts. He criticized the Macedonian Government's support of the Federal Executive Council which, as he said, is interfering in the internal affairs of two sovereign states, Croatia and Slovenia.

Representatives of all parties were against such views of the VMRO and their resolution. Some deputies condemned the unilateral dissociation of Slovenia and Croatia from Yugoslavia. They said Yugoslavia was created with enormous sacrifice and its [word indistinct] disintegration cannot be accepted. The decision on Macedonia's secession can only be made by the Macedonian people.

There was a disturbance in the assembly when the leader of the VMRO and vice president of Macedonia, Ljupco Georgijevski, called the (?present) journalists enemies of Macedonia, saying that they were irresponsible and that they should become more serious.

Journalists vociferously reacted to what they said were ludicrous accusations, and except for the DELO and HINA correspondents, walked out of the gallery from

where they were following the work of the parliament. Tupurkovski called for a recess in order to talk to the journalists and persuade them to come back.

The assembly is still in recess.

VMRO Prepares Macedonian Independence Call

AU2606185291 Belgrade Radio Belgrade Network in Serbo-Croatian 1700 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Boris Djordjioski report]

[Text] The Macedonian Assembly is currently holding a session in Skopje. It is not difficult to guess its agenda, which is the Yugoslav political situation. Our correspondent Boris Djordjioski reports from Skopje:

[Djordjioski] Here in Skopje it is expected that the delegates will be addressed by Kiro Gligorov, president of the republic, or Vasil Tupurkovski, member of the state presidency, and that Nikola Kljusev, republican premier, will present the stand of the Macedonian Government concerning the situation in the country following the decision of Croatia and Slovenia to proclaim themselves independent and autonomous states. The government seems to need almost a whole day to present its views.

However, the VMRO-Democratic Party for Macedonian National Unity has hurried and informed journalists that it has congratulated the Slovene and Croat people on their states, expressing the hope that the people of Macedonia will also see that day. This is why the VMRO has hurried and prepared for this session a text of a resolution by which Macedonia would be proclaimed a sovereign and independent state.

International

Britain Confirms Support for Federal Government

LD2606153591 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1422 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] London, June 26 (TANJUG)—Official British sources assess that yesterday's decisions by the Yugoslav parliament and the Yugoslav Government are absolutely founded and in keeping with the Yugoslav Constitution, and that they should be supported.

Well-informed circles in the British Foreign Office underscore that the British Government is not even considering the possiblity of recognizing Slovenia and Croatia as independent states because there are no conditions for that.

Britain has on several occasions repeated that it will support only a unified Yugoslavia, within the framework of its present borders, while the country's internal organization is a matter of agreement between Yugoslav leaders, but without actions which could interrupt a peaceful and constructive dialogue.

TANJUG Cites EC 'Circles' on Situation

LD2606173391 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1608 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Brussels, June 26 (TANJUG)—The governments of twelve countries of the European Community (E.C.) maintain the stand not to recognize the independence of Slovenia and Croatia, as confirmed to TANJUG correspondent. Consultations are underway over the stand which the E.C. will take on the latest developments in Yugoslavia, TANJUG learned in official E.C. circles in Brussels this afternoon.

The stand with regard to the crisis in Yugoslavia and the proclamation of independence by two of its republics will feature as the most important topic to be discussed by the E.C. heads of states and governments in Luxembourg on Friday and Saturday, the sources here underscored.

"The E.C. governments wish to achieve a highly balanced consensus in the stand towards the proclamation of independence by Slovenia and Croatia. They will carefully weigh out their words in order not to create an impression of being in favour of any side in Yugoslavia's internal dispute."

TANJUG correspondent was told that the E.C. absolutely urges a peaceful solution of the crisis, wishing all the Yugoslav peoples to organize their life through accord and in such as a way as best suits them, Brussels sources underscore.

Greece Fails To Recognize Croatia, Slovenia

LD2606174691 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1520 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Athens, June 26 (TANJUG)—Greece said today that it will not recognize the "unilateral decisions" of the Yugoslav republics of Slovenia and Croatia on secession. Greece "and other E.C. countries" underscore the importance of preserving a unified Yugoslavia.

Concerning Slovenia's and Croatia's decision to secede from Yugoslavia, the Greek Foreign Ministry has issued a statement saying that Greece "is closely following political developments in Yugoslavia, which is natural, since they concern the future of a neighbouring and friendly country, and also stability and peace in the Balkans."

"We believe in the maintenance of a unified Yugoslav state and in the resolving of disputes through peaceful discussion between the republics."

"We will not recognize the unilateral decision of any one of the republics."

Belgrade Diplomatic Community Briefed on Situation

LD2606184391 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1636 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Belgrade, June 26 (TANJUG)—Yugoslav Foreign Minister Budimir Loncar today acquainted the ambassadors from several Western, non-aligned and neutral countries with the Yugoslav Government's expectations that the efforts for the peaceful settlement of the problems in the country will be met with the understanding and support of friendly countries and international organizations.

Loncar acquainted the ambassadors of the countries which are permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, neighboring and certain countries of the European Community, as well as non-aligned, neutral and other countries with the conclusions and decisions of the Federal Assembly and the government following the latest developments in Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia on its part indicated the efforts for the problems in the country to be resolved in a peaceful manner and in line with the federal Constitution in order to create as soon as possible conditions which are necessary for the continuation of the process of democratization and reforms and for the democratic talks on the future organization of Yugoslavia.

Bulgaria's Vulkov Denies Recognition of Croatia

LD2606133391 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1229 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Sofia, June 26 (TANJUG)—Bulgarian Foreign Mininster Viktor Vulkov today denied a statement made by President of Croatia Franjo Tudjman that Sofia had recognized the independence of this Yugoslav republic.

Bulgaria has not recognized Croatia and this issue has not been raised by anybody, Valkov stressed in a meeting with Yugoslav Ambassador to Bulgaria Milenko Stefanovic.

Ambassador Stefanovic demanded an explanation for Tudjman's statement that 'Bulgaria was the first country to recognize Croatia's independence'.

Valkov said the statement was a pure fabrication. No official Bulgarian body or Bulgarian Government representative has said anything like that, he stressed.

The Republic of Bulgaria reiterates its commitment to preserving the unity of Yugoslavia and promoting relations with that country and its republics on the basis of equality, mutual benefit, and historical and present-day realities, the Bulgarian minister said in a statement read to reporters today by head of the ministry's Balkan division Minko Sladkarov.

Presenting Sofia's position on Croatia's and Slovenia's declarations of independence, Sladkarov said that 'such acts of free will of the Slovenian and Croatian peoples will be reviewed with utmost care and seriousness'.

External Reactions to Republics' Declaration

AU2606130991 Paris AFP in English 1218 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] June 26 (AFP) [dateline as received]—The secessionist republics of Slovenia and Croatia were waiting Wednesday for signs of international recognition as governments either declared against the breakup of Yugoslavia or adopted a cautious wait-and-see attitude.

Following Washington's expression of "regret" at Tuesday's declarations of independence, which came after warnings that it would not recognise the breakaway republics, France, Britain, Denmark and Sweden came out against the move while several countries closer to the troubled region held back from taking sides.

"France does not recognise the republics of Slovenia and Croatia", Foreign Affairs Minister Roland Dumas said after Wednesday's weekly cabinet meeting.

Expressing "regret" at the decisions taken in Ljubljana and Zagreb, he said they "could lead to the breakup of the Yugoslav federation unless new institutional arrangements are made".

In London, a Foreign Office official said the question of recognising Slovenia and Croatia as independent republics "does not arise", and urged all sides to "avoid any action which might impede or prejudice negotiations for a peaceful resolution of the crisis".

Swedish Foreign Minister Sten Andersson said Stockholm had "no reason" to recognise Slovenia and Croatia, while his Danish counterpart Uffe Ellemann-Jensen expressed a similar view, saying that his country, like its partners in the European Community, would continue to "recognise a unitary Yugoslavia".

However a split appeared to be developing on the issue in Denmark's ruling coalition, as a spokesman for the Conservative party "vigourously" supported the would-be independent states and hailed "those who fight for freedom", in sharp contrast to the Liberal Party of which Mr. Ellemann-Jensen is the leader.

Italy, which shares a common border with Slovenia, had made no comment early Wednesday but like Greece, which said there was "no question" of recognising "unilateral decisions by any Yugoslav republic", was known to be concerned at the prospect of instability in the region.

In Helsinki, a spokesman for the 25-nation Council of Europe said the Slovenes and Croats were "entitled to

self-determination, but respecting international laws and in the spirit of the Helsinki process".

In Prague, which is faced with secessionist pressures from Slovakia within the Czechoslovak federation, Foreign Minister Jiri Dienstbier opted for caution, saying the secessions were "an internal Yugoslav affair", while Prime Minister Marian Calfa said his government would "examine the new situation in Yugoslavia at its next meeting when it has seen the official documents".

Opinion in Austria, Slovenia's northern neighbour, was broadly sympathetic, with the press and several regional governors expressing support for their former countrymen in the Austro- Hungarian empire, but officials were cautious following Chancellor Franz Vranitzky's statement late Tuesday that Austria would "scrupulously observe the rules of international law".

Bulgaria denied late Tuesday a reported statement by Croatian President Franjo Tudjman according to which Sofia had recognised Croatia's independence, and Foreign Minister Viktor Vulkov said Wednesday that his country favoured "the preservation of Yugoslavia's integrity".

Bulgaria has a substantial population of ethnic Macedonians in the region bordering the southern Yugoslav republic of Macedonia.

And Romania, another Balkan republic comprising numerous ethnic groupings, said it "favours the territorial unity of Yugoslavia". While "supporting the democratic process in Yugoslavia", Bucharest thought it would not be helpful to support the "trend to dismantlement".

Tanks Heading for Slovene-Italian Border

LD2706103591 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 0950 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] Ljubljana, 27 Jun (TANJUG)—Yugoslav People's Army [JNA] units are moving toward the border crossing with Italy at Fernetici. The JNA has ordered the commander of the border militia at the Krvavi Potok crossing, which is also on the Italian border, to ensure that the Slovene militia leaves the border by 1100. Radio Slovenia reports that mainly foreigners are crossing into Italy at this point. Traffic is relatively normal at the Lazaret crossing.

JNA tank units have moved from Vipava in the direction of Ajdovscina where, however, roadblocks await them. This morning the only public means of transportation operating out of Nova Gorica was the railway. Buses are not operating from Koper and one bus which left for Ljubljana was stopped before it reached its destination. There are reports from the coast that work is under way to close the road between Secovlje and Dragonja, that is, on the Slovene-Croatian border.

Situation on Border 'Tense'

LD2606171291 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1641 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Ljubljana, 26 Jun (TANJUG)—Several Yugoslav People's Army [JNA] tanks and armored vehicles have stopped this evening at the Lipica border crossing with Italy. The border crossing is not closed, but on both sides of the crossing there are neither passengers nor vehicles wanting to cross the border.

JNA units warned member of the Slovene police to respect legitimate and internationally recognized symbols marking the SFRY border with the Republic of Italy.

The situation is tense on (?other) border crossings with neighboring Italy. Members of the Slovene police and customs officials are nervously and with great uncertainty waiting to see whether JNA units will arrive on other border crossings with Italy.

Slovenia Protests Italian Troop Movements

LD2606204891 Ljubljana Radio Slovenia Network in Slovene 2000 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Slovene Foreign Affairs Minister Dimitrij Rupel sent a telegram this afternoon to Italian Foreign Minister Gianni de Michelis expressing the concern of the Slovene Government over Italian military concentrations on the state border between the Republic of Slovenia and the Republic of Italy. Because in our country this military concentration is being abused as a pretext for Yugoslav Army movements in the direction of the Italian border, Dr. Dimitrij Rupel asked the Italian foreign minister to intervene with the Italian Government to influence a reduction in the strength of the Italian military units because good relations between the two states provide no ground for actions of this sort.

JNA Armored Units Move Toward Austrian Border

LD2706094591 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 0836 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] Maribor, 27 Jun (TANJUG)—Armored units of the Yugoslav People's Army [JNA] left Maribor this morning in the direction of the border crossing with Austria. One column is advancing along the road toward Sentilj. Another one is moving through the Drava river valley toward Dravograd and the border crossing at Vic.

Although the roads are blocked by barricades of trucks and other vehicles, by 1000 [0800 GMT] the armored units had advanced up to Pesnica, 10 km from the Austrian border, and to Ruse in the Drava river valley.

Vienna Radio Reports Belgrade Reaction

AU2606114491 Vienna Oesterreich Eins Radio Network in German 1000 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Austrian Broadcasting Service Yugoslavia Correspondent Georg Dox report from Belgrade]

[Excerpts] In Belgrade the situation is still calm. There are no demonstrations, no rallies of pro-Serbian or pro-Yugoslav circles. [passage omitted]

Belgrade media reported very exhaustively and probably not unintentionally about the [international] rejection of the declarations of independence. It was intended to show to the people that the international community of states condemns the declarations of independence of Croatia and Slovenia and considers them a danger to the internal peace of the country and of the entire region. [passage omitted]